


For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/McKay1977>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ESTABLISHMENT AND VALIDATION OF A SET OF CRITERIA
TO DEFINE AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO
LANGUAGE ARTS

by



ROBERTA ANNE BAER MCKAY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1977

ABSTRACT

This study evolved for the purposes of attempting to establish and validate a set of criteria to define, at a certain level of generality, an integrated approach to language arts.

The first phase of the study involved a search of the related literature in order to synthesize a set of criteria, defining an integrated approach to the language arts. The final 17 criteria were seen as being the reoccurring themes defining an integrated approach to the language arts in the literature.

Validation of the criteria, the second phase of the study, was accomplished through the sampling of the opinions of two expert groups, who were chosen for their expertise in the field of language arts. The groups included instructional respondents, those involved directly in classroom teaching, and non-instructional respondents, those involved with the creation and implementation of language arts programs, and not directly involved in classroom teaching. Two such expert groups were consulted in order to determine similarities and differences between and within the groups in validating the criteria.

An instrument in the form of a survey questionnaire was constructed. It consisted of each of the 17 criteria stated in three forms: a Reaction Statement, Explanation, and Practical Application. The respondents were asked to rate each criterion as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate* according to their perceptions of an integrated approach to language arts. Space was provided for the respondents to add criteria and to comment on the stated criteria.

Analysis of the data was both quantitative and qualitative. For purposes of the quantitative analysis, five groups were identified: the Grand Total group (59 respondents), the Non-instructional group (20 respondents), the Total Instructional group (39 respondents), the Division I instructional group (22 respondents), and the Division II instructional group (17 respondents).

Responses were tallied for each group for each item. A criterion was considered validated as defining an integrated approach to language arts for a particular group when the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses were 80% or more of the total responses to that item by that group. This score was termed the validation score.

Analysis of the validation scores revealed that all of the criteria, with the exception of one, Criterion #4, were validated by the total expert group as defining an integrated approach to the language arts. Some diversity existed within and between the groups on individual items.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made with respect to the criteria suggested some explanations for the quantitative findings.

The validated criteria may prove useful as a focus for further investigation into the nature of integrated language arts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to express appreciation to the many people who made the completion of this thesis possible. Although it is impossible to name all concerned, the writer would particularly like to acknowledge the following people, who were indispensable to the successful finished product.

Sincerest thanks to Dr. R. K. Jackson and Dr. W. D. Wilde for their expertise and the many valuable suggestions which they contributed to the study and to the writing of the thesis. Appreciation is extended to Dr. P. J. Miller who posed some challenging questions in connection with the study. The writer would also like to acknowledge the helpful suggestions and comments made by Dr. P. A. McFetridge in the initial stages of the study.

Without the cooperation of the Edmonton Public School Board, the Edmonton Separate School Board, the County of Strathcona School System, the St. Albert Protestant Separate School Board, and Alberta Education the study would not have been possible. Thank you is also extended to the individual respondents who gave of their time and knowledge in completing the questionnaire.

The expertise of Mrs. Margaret Voice in preparing the final draft of the thesis is gratefully acknowledged.

And finally to my husband, my parents, and my friends, I would like to say a special thank you for the encouragement, support, and understanding that was given throughout the months of completing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. THE PROBLEM	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
PURPOSES OF THE STUDY	2
THE QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN THE STUDY	3
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THE STUDY	3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	5
Sample	5
Procedures	5
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	6
2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	8
INTRODUCTION	8
THE HISTORY OF INTEGRATION IN NORTH AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT	8
Summary	17
CURRENT LITERATURE ON INTEGRATION IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS	19
Introduction	19
The Elements of Integrated Language Arts	20
Summary	28
The Purposes of Integrated Language Arts	28
Summary	33
The Foundations of Integrated Language Arts	34
Summary	42

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Organization of Integrated Language Arts	42
Summary	48
CONCLUSION	49
3. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	51
INTRODUCTION	51
CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT	51
Development of the Criteria	51
The Instrument	53
POPULATION AND SAMPLE	55
ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING	57
Administration	57
Scoring	58
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	59
SUMMARY	59
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	61
INTRODUCTION	61
THE ANALYSES	62
Quantitative Analysis	62
The Groups	62
Tallying the Responses	62
Converting the Tallies to Percentages	65
Rank Order	67
Qualitative Analysis	70
Nature of the Analysis	70
THE FINDINGS	72

CHAPTER	PAGE
Additional Criteria	93
General Comments on the Criteria	94
SUMMARY	95
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	100
SUMMARY	100
The Purpose	100
Sample and Design	100
The Findings	102
CONCLUSIONS	106
IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION	108
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	113
APPENDIX A. THE INSTRUMENT	119
APPENDIX B. ACTUAL WRITTEN COMMENTS MADE BY RESPONDENTS	127

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Tallies for Each Group for Each Item	63
2. Summary of <i>Highly Appropriate</i> and <i>Appropriate</i> Responses for the Two Major Expert Groups	66
3. Validation Scores for Each Group for Each Item	68
4. Rank Order of Validated Criteria for Each Group	69
5. Number of Comments Made on Each Item by the Two Expert Groups	71
6. Number of <i>Appropriate</i> and <i>Highly Appropriate</i> Responses for Each Group for Each Item	74
7. Items in Which Validation Scores of the Instructional and Non-instructional Groups Differed by 5% or More	76
8. Items in Which Validation Scores Between the Division I and Division II Groups Differed by 5% or More	80

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The integrating of knowledge, although not a new concept in education, has recently become a focus in language arts curriculum planning. In the elementary school, the concept of language arts was designed to overcome compartmentalization and to facilitate the integration of previously related but separate subjects such as reading, composition, handwriting, spelling, and language. It was hoped that by combining the subjects under the rubric of language arts, and providing a block of time for them in the timetabling schedule, integration would occur. Unfortunately, the hoped-for integration did not materialize and in many cases the reorganization was only formal. Today, the focus is on integrating the language arts, another attempt to solve the problem of compartmentalization of the communication processes in the elementary curriculum.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Integration in the language arts is an attempt to bring or fit together the processes of communication including the non-verbal aspects and the verbal aspects such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This problem of lack of integration in the communicative processes is uniquely a pedagogical problem. The divisions among the communicative processes are entirely artificial and,

unfortunately, are found only within the school curriculum. In our everyday dealings, communication is an integrated whole. It has not happened too soon that educators have become aware of the affects of artificially compartmentalizing the communicative processes in the school curriculum.

Although integration in the language arts is now a popular educational slogan, there is little or no research which defines in general terms what might constitute an integrated approach to the language arts. It would seem that such a body of statements might be of considerable assistance for curriculum developers and teachers in their attempts to foster integration in the elementary school language arts curriculum.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were:

1. To establish a set of criteria gleaned from the related literature which would attempt to define an integrated approach to the language arts.
2. To validate the criteria through the ratings of two expert groups, including a non-instructional group, composed of persons involved in the creation and implementation of language arts programs, and an instructional group, composed of persons directly involved in the classroom teaching of the language arts and meeting certain selection criteria.
3. To compare the ratings of the two expert groups to determine similarities and differences in the validation of the criteria between and among the two groups.

THE QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN THE STUDY

The following questions provided the focus of the study:

1. Is it possible through a synthesis of related literature to establish a set of criteria to define an integrated approach to language arts?
2. Will the criteria be validated by the ratings of two expert groups, including non-instructional and instructional respondents, as statements which in their judgement define an integrated approach to language arts?
3. Is it possible to detect any similarities and differences in the validation of the criteria between and among the two expert groups?

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THE STUDY

In addition to the terms defined below, the investigator has used the term "language" throughout the study in general reference to all four aspects of verbal communication: listening, speaking, reading, writing, except where specifically noted as some other usage.

Non-instructional Experts: This group would include persons not directly involved in the classroom teaching of language arts, but rather would encompass those persons responsible for the creation and implementation of language arts programs within the province of Alberta. University professors, language arts consultants, language arts supervisory personnel, and Department of Education personnel involved

with the language arts curriculum therefore would be consulted.

Instructional Experts: This group would include teachers from

typical elementary classrooms who met the following teacher selection criteria:

- a. expresses willingness to complete a brief questionnaire, rating a set of defining criteria on integrated language arts.
- b. has a minimum of two years teaching experience.
- c. teaches any grade between or including grades one and six.
- d. teaches language arts on a regular basis in a normal classroom.
- e. is viewed by supervisors as a successful language arts teacher.
- f. has a minimum of three years training in Education

OR

has at least two university courses in curriculum and instruction in reading and/or language.

Criterion: For the purposes of this study, a criterion constituted a reoccurring theme in the literature, which was stated as a general principle defining an integrated approach to language arts.

Validated Criterion: In this study a criterion was considered validated, as defining an integrated approach to language arts for a particular group, when the combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses for that group were

80% or more of the total responses to that item for that group.

Validation Score: The validation score was the percentage obtained by calculating the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses out of the total number of responses to an item for a particular group.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Sample

Respondents were approached on the basis of interest in the study and expertise in the field of language arts. There were two expert groups, including a non-instructional group and an instructional group. There were 20 non-instructional experts in the sample drawn from University professors, school board consultants and supervisors, school language arts supervisors, and Department of Education language arts personnel, and 39 instructional experts drawn from the Edmonton Public School Board, the Edmonton Separate School Board, the County of Strathcona No. 20 School System, and the St. Albert Protestant Separate School Board.

Procedures

Seventeen criteria, seen by the investigator as being the reoccurring themes within the literature searched, were synthesized. These were contained in an instrument in the form of a survey questionnaire where respondents read each criterion as a Reaction Statement, accompanied by an explanatory statement and a practical application statement. The latter two statements were included to

clarify the intention of each criterion. The respondents were asked to rate each criterion as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate* to their ideas of an integrated language arts approach. The respondents were also asked to add any criteria which they felt may have been neglected in defining an integrated approach to language arts, and to comment on any reactions they may have had to the stated criteria.

The specification for validation of a particular criterion was that any criterion in which the combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses for any group were 80% or more of the total responses to that item, would be accepted as a validated criterion to define an integrated approach to language arts for that particular group. Tallies were done for each criterion and percentages were obtained in order to decide whether or not a particular criterion was validated for a particular group. A qualitative analysis was also done on comments made by the respondents to determine if the comments elucidated the quantitative findings.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It would seem that a validated set of criteria defining an integrated approach to language arts would have value for both program developers and teachers, in the creation and evaluation of programs in elementary language arts. The patterns of validation of the criteria between the two expert groups have implications for program creation and implementation in that, if the perceptions of the two groups differ widely on what constitutes an integrated

approach to language arts, a need for greater communication between the two groups would be indicated if such programs were to be successfully implemented throughout Alberta. Patterns of validation occurring within the instructional group may indicate where differences in approach are necessary depending on grade level.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The concept of integration in the language arts cannot be thoroughly understood without an historical examination of integration as a curriculum concept in educational thought. The historical perspective on integration provides the reader with some feeling for the illusive nature of this process and the difficulty of translating integration the concept, into integration the practice.

Integration as a general curriculum concept will be discussed from the point of time in history where integration became of influence in North American educational thought. This discussion will serve as background to the remainder of Chapter Two, which will focus specifically on the current literature on integration in the language arts.

THE HISTORY OF INTEGRATION IN NORTH AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

Integration as a curriculum concept in North American education had its beginnings in the pedagogy of Johann Friedrich Herbart, an eighteenth century German educator. Herbart believed that daily experience gave knowledge, but not organized knowledge.

The task of instruction was to enable the student to organize what he knew. Not only were inchoate masses of knowledge useless for cognitive thought; more important, such bits and pieces did not build those

vast, unbroken circles of thought that Herbart saw as the only basis of moral strength of character (Dunkel, 1969:73-74).

Although Herbart's doctrines in and of themselves are not widely remembered by educators, the educational movement which evolved after his death and became known as Herbartianism kept his name alive. The principles ascribed to by the movement were, at the most, only implied by Herbart's original doctrine. While Herbartianism did not represent the practical application or the historical development of Herbart's ideas, it did, in Dunkel's words, become a "rather lively and fairly influential educational movement" in Europe and America (1969:131).

The contribution of Herbartianism to the concept of integration was made by the founder of the movement, Tuiskon Ziller. One of Ziller's additions to Herbart's doctrine was the idea of "concentration centers."

A concentration center was a general topic on which the work of a whole school year focussed. Ziller undoubtedly felt that in introducing the concentration centers he was simply following Herbart to the point that the latter should have reached himself had he developed his own principles to their proper conclusions. Herbart had made much of the "unbroken circle of thought, close knit in all its parts." Only such a unified circle of thought could produce the desired unity of consciousness and integrity of character. But Ziller, as he looked at Herbart's programs, either as set forth in his books or as actualized in practical programs, felt that the necessary unity was certain to be lacking. The work of a given year would be fragmented into a set of subject matters or a series of topics unless some specific effort at integration was made. The purpose of the concentration center was, therefore, to produce a unified circle of thought by concentrating on a single major theme or topic (Dunkel, 1969:107-108).

According to Dunkel (1969), American Herbartianism as a theoretical

movement, flourished for about fifteen years, reached its peak in about 1896, and declined with the advent of Dewey and the experimental psychologists around 1905.

The concept of integration was revived by the progressive education movement. The enterprise school, described by Donald Dickie (1941:82), as "of the progressive type," tried, as had Ziller with the concept of concentration centers, to provide central themes around which to unify the particular subjects. The theory behind the enterprise school held that the information used in the conduct of daily life was integrated information. The enterprise school sought to reflect daily life situations by having as a focus social problems or enterprises which the children would study using integrated information. Specific lessons in any particular subject were taught at any time "when it is required for the satisfactory progress of the enterprise" (Dickie, 1941:98).

The enterprise system made particular reference to the importance of the part played by language in the enterprise work. Dickie stressed the fact that the enterprise provided "a constant need" (321) for a variety of opportunities for self-expression. Among the variety of opportunities for self-expression mentioned were: holding meetings; writing minutes; convening or acting as members of committees; expressing, in both speech and writing, ideas, opinions, decisions; planning through conversation and discussion; making notes; speaking and writing reports and minutes, writing letters; giving talks; telling stories; creating, practicing, and presenting radio broadcasts, choral recitations, pageants, plays,

and "talkies"; writing stories, verses, plays and articles for inclusion in notebooks; and finally, at the conclusion of the enterprise, participating in one or more forms of oral presentation.

Dickie states:

Moreover, the variety of these forms used in the enterprise, appeals to the child; he is eager to try them all; and the daily need to practice them before an audience prepared to applaud, or to criticize, stimulates his desire to learn to speak or write well. This "whole process" type of experience will undoubtedly bring about a very considerable advance in ability, but, as has been pointed out in a previous chapter, practice in the separate elements is also essential to the attainment of real efficiency in any skill (1941:322).

The distinction repeatedly mentioned by Dickie between skills and content is of tremendous import to the concept of integration. The skills—language, reading, writing, arithmetic—consist of symbols and relationships. The content consists of facts and groups of facts. "The symbols have no intrinsic value. They are simply the tools, or counters, that the individual uses to produce the particular order that expresses his meaning" (Dickie, 1941:103).

Dickie emphasized that both the content and the skills must be learned functionally.

It is obvious even to a child that these are not ends in themselves. We do not learn to read and then plan activities in order that we may have something to read about; we engage in some undertaking and presently find that we need to read to get information about it. The purpose to be attained both motivates and provides opportunities for practice in the skills (1941:117).

Dickie saw two kinds of practice necessary to achieve a high degree of facility in any particular skill—"whole process" practice as provided by the enterprise system, and "element" practice,

specific practice, for those who needed it, in the elements of a skill (104).

The Herbartians' concentration centers and Dickie's enterprise system both aspired to attain integration by having students bring together all their knowledge from the various fields and apply it to one theme, topic, or problem. Carleton Washburne (1940) added another dimension to the concept of integration. This dimension shifted the emphasis in integrating knowledge from the skills and content to the individual.

Washburne felt a deep frustration with educational terminology and cited a proliferation of terms which he felt "were all meant to embrace one essential idea" (1940:272). Among these terms were: correlation, learning by doing, progressive education, child-centered school, project method, activity school, and integration. He believed these terms to be a reaction against the traditional school where all children were given the same prescribed subject matter in "separate and unrelated packets, called subjects, under a system of reward and punishment called marks or grades" (272). Washburne saw the new terminology as seeking to embrace the concept of "the organization of the child's environment in such a way that his individually and socially satisfying development takes place through his own activity and through the assimilation of learning in meaningful and related wholes, free from artificial boundaries, and in an atmosphere of happiness, interest, and growth" (272). Washburne pinpointed a grave, pervading, and as yet unresolved weakness in the educational quest for the above concept:

The successive terms used to express this idea have tended to weaken—the idea has become diluted in traditional practice until it has become lost. Then with a new term the idea has received a new life, again to lose it in a slough of tradition, a welter of misunderstandings (1940:273).

For Washburne, the essentials of integration involved the relating of each unit of learning to the child's experience and sense of need. He rejected the idea that integration necessarily meant "that all phases of a child's learning during a given day or week or month must be related to a single major activity or project or center of interest" (279). Washburne suggested that integration should be regarded in relation to the learner, rather than to subjects and activities. He stressed the fact that in integration it was the child's learning that needed to be integrated with his own life and experience, rather than specific subject matter that needed to be integrated with other subject matter.

Washburne cautioned against the artificial drawing of subject matter boundaries but also suggested that artificial connection and forced correlation were equally undesirable. He saw functional learning as the key to integration, helping children "to acquire the ideals, concepts, knowledge, skills, and conventions necessary for social interrelationships, not superficially and in isolation, but vitally in a setting of use, with a recognition of a need, and on a foundation of experience" (302).

It has been asserted that integration as a curriculum concept is not a new idea. Dressel (1958) states that, "Plato was concerned with the problem of integration and so, no doubt, was every thinker on educational matters before and since him" (7). Dressel, like

Washburne, is concerned with integration as a process and suggests that "the task is not that of communicating to the individual an integrated view of all knowledge; it is rather that of developing individuals who will seek to do this for themselves" (1958:5).

Dressel defines the essential elements of integration as "the existence of parts which can be so related as to make a whole . . . integration involves the adjustment, the proper relationship of part to part, part to whole, and whole to part, and the combining of these parts into a complex whole" (1958:11).

In summarizing the various attempts made at integration in the past, Dressel classifies three types:

- (a) those developing interrelationships among existing courses,
- (b) those involving reorganization of content into more general courses and
- (c) those involving the centering of content about vital problems of society or of the student.

Although many focuses have been used as a basis for promoting integration, Dressel suggests that by its very nature integration "means that a multiplicity of approaches must be used and properly interrelated or integrated among themselves" (1958:20). Since our knowledge is constantly changing, complete integration of knowledge is probably impossible. With this in mind, Dressel postulates that:

Our concern with integration, then, must be with the integrative process in which man engages as he strives to organize in meaningful fashion knowledge and experience which at first seem largely unrelated. Specifically, we want an educational program which turns out individuals desirous and capable of such continuing integration (1958:22).

Dressel's article on integration appears in the 1958

yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education, formerly the National Herbart Society. Another contributor to the yearbook entitled The Integration of Educational Experiences, is David R. Krathwohl. He defines educational integration as "an organizing experience that takes place in the mind of the learner" (1958:43). He further emphasizes Dressel's position on the importance of recognizing integration not only as a method of organizing content, but also as a process taking place in the individual. Providing situations where the content is so organized as to facilitate integrative behavior on the part of the student, is seen by Krathwohl as being the function of the teacher.

Typically, when teachers are integration-conscious, they are concerned with interrelationships of courses. Such interrelationships are important, but their primary importance lies in helping the student engage in integrative behavior. The focus of concern is the thinking of the student. Accordingly, the teacher's role is twofold: (a) developing classroom situations which cause the student to work at pulling his experiences together into a satisfying, unified picture, and (b) instilling in the student the desire to consistently treat his experience this way (1958:44).

Taba (1962) suggests that although integration is an old theme in education, it has never been realized, "partly because of fear of loss of disciplined learning if the study of specialized subjects is discarded, and partly because as yet no effective basis has been found for unifying school subjects" (1962:299). She too draws a distinction between integration as the organization of curriculum and integration as something that happens in an individual. "The problem, then, is that of developing ways of helping individuals in this process of creating a unity of

knowledge" (1962:299).

The broad fields curriculum is seen by Taba as being one of the typical attempts at reorganizing the curriculum to meet the demands of integration. In an effort to overcome the compartmentalization and atomization inherent in a separate-subject curriculum, the broad fields curriculum organization combines several specific areas into larger fields. As a result, subjects such as reading, spelling, language, handwriting, and composition become language arts; history and geography become social studies.

The main advantages of this organization were seen as being (a) greater integration of subject matter, (b) a more functional organization of knowledge, (c) broader coverage, (d) less emphasis on excessive detail, and (e) a greater flexibility in the choice of content. On the elementary school level, the broad fields approach has "practically become a standard" (Taba, 1962:393).

The broad fields curriculum concept did not produce the hoped for integration and unification of knowledge, since in many cases, the reorganization was only formal. Taba suggests that combining subjects rather than integrating ideas has been the rule rather than the exception and further, that in the process of combining subjects, one usually has become dominant over the others (1962:411). The combining of subjects can only be effective if a new organization is devised. "Imposing a new curriculum design on top of unrevised teaching-learning units is like putting a new front on an old house whose interior remains the same" (Taba, 1962:344).

Taba has suggested that to revise the teaching-learning

units the emphasis should be on locating integrative threads, rather than on integrating subjects (1962:299). Bloom (1958:91) has defined an integrative thread as "any idea, problem, method, or device by which two or more separate learning experiences are related." He delineates five major criteria for the selection, development and use of integrative threads:

1. should provide continuing usefulness in relation to a great variety of problems and questions.
2. should exhibit ability to be altered, improved, and extended in meaning with time and experience.
3. should serve in comparing and contrasting experiences which would be otherwise unrelated.
4. should be sufficiently comprehensive to extend over entire range of subject matter or experiences in some area of human experience.
5. should be meaningful to the student.

Generally, integrative threads seem to be powerful concepts and generalizations initially related to the student's experience, which assist him in the process of relating separate learning experiences.

Summary

The concept of integration of knowledge has long been valued in formal education as something worthwhile. The Herbartians recognized the need to provide for this type of organization, through concentration centers, rather than leaving it to chance. The notion that integration would occur as a result of the concentration on one theme upon which all knowledge was brought to bear, was oversimplified.

The enterprise system also provided a structured content organization to achieve integration. This system implied that

knowledge was integrated in the child's mind and that the enterprise would foster the use of this integrated information.

Washburne, Dressel, and Krathwohl emphasized the necessity of regarding integration as a process taking place within the individual. They believed that more needed to be done to achieve integration than to organize content and skills around one theme or social problem. Although initially, organized content and skills to foster this process were considered important, the goal was to produce individuals who could and would engage in the integrative process on their own. In other words, the goal was individuals who would be able to take knowledge in whatever form it came to them and integrate it with the knowledge they already possessed, modifying and changing their knowledge structures as required. Integration in this sense becomes a method of thinking, a system of organizing knowledge, in such a way that relationships are seen between various separate pieces of information. This implies that the integrative process can be taught. Taba and Bloom suggest that since other methods of organizing content seem to have failed in their goal of producing integration, a new organization is necessary. Bloom believes the concept of integrative threads may help to achieve the relating of separate learning experiences.

From this brief and selective account of the history of integration in North American educational thought, it is clear that integration is perceived as being desirable. It is also clear that the elements of integration have defied and continue to defy explicit definition. Washburne's lament on the loss of the essence

of the concept in terminology, traditional practice, and misunderstanding continues to plague any widespread adoption of the notion of integration of knowledge. To say that integration has never been achieved is not correct. It is probably safe to assume that throughout the years there have been astute and excellent teachers who have appreciated, wittingly, or unwittingly, the essence of integration and have helped to produce "integrating" individuals. They, undoubtedly, have fostered integrative behaviour by treating integration not only as a method of organizing content, but also as a process within the individual.

CURRENT LITERATURE ON INTEGRATION IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS

Introduction

Echoes of Washburne resound in Halliday's words when he states, "there is probably no subject in the curriculum whose aims are so often formulated as are those of English language; yet they remain by and large ill-defined, controversial and obscure" (1967:80). The vast proliferation of material written in the area of language arts serves as ample testimony to the fact that a multitude of diverse interpretations continues to plague the definition of aims and procedures within language arts.

Within the last ten years, the concept of integration has been more closely and specifically associated with language arts. Although the labelling of the previously separated communication skills under the rubric of language arts was intended to facilitate integration, Taba has suggested that the reorganization was in many

cases only superficial. Recent literature in language arts stresses the need to "integrate" the language arts. This portion of Chapter Two will attempt to deal with some of the current literature.

In light of the amount of material written on the subject of language arts, the investigator will discuss only the literature which directly influenced the selection of the criteria defining an integrated approach to language arts. The literature will be discussed under the following categories: the elements of integrated language arts, the purposes of integrated language arts, the foundations of integrated language arts, and the organization of integrated language arts. The end of each section will include a brief summary, indicating the reoccurring themes which evolved from the literature.

The Elements of Integrated Language Arts

The following section reviews the literature defining the components of integrated language arts. The elements and their interrelationships are explored, with specific reference to the educational setting, where the necessity of achieving balance among the various elements is stressed.

The arts of language are generally stated to include the receptive arts of listening and reading, and the expressive arts of speaking and writing. Thorn and Braun state:

Language is a code developed and shared by the members of a society to enable them to communicate effectively with each other. Although language is only one of many tools of communication, in order to participate fully in the life of a literate community, an individual must master both the oral and written forms of the language code and learn to use them as both receptive

and expressive tools. This means mastery of four aspects of language—listening, speaking, reading, and writing (1974:53).

Smith, Goodman, and Meredith also view communication as "a two-way process of output and input, of speaking and listening, of writing and reading, of presenting and receiving" (1976:207).

Viewing the language arts as listening, speaking, reading, and writing is aimed at achieving a broader balance in a program where reading has traditionally been a central focus. Moffett suggests that this is understandable since reading is the pathway to most school learning and has often been the main measure of successful teaching (1968:18). Moffett is of the belief that the importance of reading has "swelled out of reasonable proportion, to its own detriment as well as to the detriment of other activities."

Evanechko has proposed a reassessment of the task of language development.

In this reassessment I believe it important to place all of the language skills in their proper perspective which means giving additional attention to developing the expressive skills of language, writing (including spelling and handwriting) and speaking, as well as to the receptive skills of listening. All of them should be learned in an integrated basis with reading (1975:840).

The need for balance within the language arts program has long been recognized. As early as 1928, Rankin suggested that 70% of the adult waking day was spent in verbal communication, and that of this time, 42% was spent in listening, 32% in speaking, 15% in reading, and 11% in writing. He then compared this to the relative amount of time spent in school on these activities (1928:629). The NCTE, citing Rankin's findings stated that "emphasis in the school

program proved to be 52% to reading, 30% to writing, 10% to speaking, and 8% to listening" (1952:191). It would appear from this evidence that the communication skills emphasized in school are those most infrequently used in the course of adult life.

Conclusions reached by the National Council of Teachers of English committee, based on Rankin's findings, included recommendations that greater emphasis be given to speaking experiences, specific instruction in listening, practical and creative writing experiences, and the development of critical reading skills (1952:194-195).

Rankin's own conclusions regarding the relative emphases accorded to the various elements of the language arts stressed the importance of developing oral language skills, particularly the ability to understand oral language, that is, listening skills. He also states that "the present emphasis on the four language arts in the school, as measured by the relative time allotments, is inversely proportional to the frequency of their use in life" (1928: 630).

Margaret Early, in an article entitled, "The Four Wheel Drive," suggests that a partial explanation for the emphasis accorded to reading has been based on the erroneous assumption that children need to be taught to read and write, while they learn naturally to listen and speak. Early points out this "natural" process involves almost constant reinforcement and extension by adults and older siblings, generally on a one-to-one basis. The article intimates that despite the apparent desirability of achieving balance among the language arts, there are many powerful forces blocking this

achievement.

In a significant comment made by Early, she reiterates a position taken by other writers including Moffett and Evanechko:

If teachers bear down hard on reading instruction, it is because parents, school boards, state and federal agencies, newspapers and magazines, outside evaluators, big business, the whole of corporate society tells them that they must. Their own conscience tells them they must. Their insecurities tell them that "more" is "better." If we want a balanced language arts program, with reading held in reasonable perspective, we shall have to bolster teachers' self-confidence at the same time that we convince them that children's progress in reading will not suffer—indeed will probably accelerate—if we use the other language arts to stimulate and support the reading component (1974:708).

Through the metaphor of the four-wheel drive, Early stresses the importance of a language curriculum "that makes total and balanced use of reading, writing, speaking and listening," providing children with "the power and versatility they need to go anywhere" (1974:707). Based on the literature discussed above, it would appear that achieving a balanced emphasis in the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, is a basic and crucial element of an integrated approach to language arts.

Before leaving the discussion of integrated language arts as listening, speaking, reading, and writing, it should be noted that additional elements are often included as facets of integrated language arts. "Language is not the only, and not always the most appropriate, medium for presenting one's ideas and feelings about one's world" (Smith, Goodman, and Meredith, 1976:206). Forms of non-verbal communication such as art, music, dance, and mime are also powerful modes of communication. Children should be familiar

with these modes as a way of expressing and as a way of experiencing.

Whereas listening, speaking, reading, and writing are symbolic forms of communication dealing with words, art, music, dance, and mime, are symbolic forms of communication where the impact of the total form conveys the message.

Rather than pursuing the vague concept of appreciation, the arts in the curriculum should fill the need for literacy in these particular modes of presentation. In a real sense, children need to learn how to present their ideas in art forms and how to "read" the symbolic presentations of others. Practice in the arts should be contiguous with practice in language presentation. The study of art, music, dance, and theatre is not a frill but is an essential in the curriculum (Smith, Goodman, and Meredith, 1976:120).

An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of both verbal and non-verbal modes of communication. Although art, music, dance, and mime are not "language" arts, they, along with language, are subsumed under the more general rubric of communication. It is crucial that the child be given the opportunity to express and experience in all the modes of communication.

Recognition of the fact that communication is a mosaic of various modes of receiving and expressing, necessitates an examination of the interrelatedness of the elements. Listening, speaking, reading and writing are related in that they facilitate verbal communication. They involve verbal symbols, words. Loban, in his longitudinal studies of children's language (1963), found that reading, writing, listening and speaking are all positively related. Children who were low in general oral language ability tended to be low in reading and writing achievements. Not only are the four basic elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing related

in these broad ways, but the many skills that comprise each separate process are related to each other, to the specific process, to the other processes and also to their individual skills. "The inter-relationships are many, varied, and in numerous ways highly intricate" (Greene and Petty, 1975:4).

Of special consideration is the relationship of the language arts to thinking.

Language and thinking are so interrelated in most forms of sophisticated thinking that they must be dealt with together. Psychologists need to be interested in the question of where language and thought are separated, but educators need to be concerned with where they fit together, because language is the main vehicle for the teaching of thinking and reasoning (Smith, Goodman, and Meredith, 1976:128).

The nature of the relationship between language and thought is a moot point, as evidenced by the opposing positions held by Piaget and Vygotsky, the former suggesting that language may be led by thought, and the latter that thought may be led by language. For the purposes of education, Smith, Goodman, and Meredith propose a compromise position which:

. . . embraces a concept of "dialogue" in which the language of children and the language of the adult teachers are brought into interplay at every stage of the development of language and thinking, including an initial "discovery" period. The collective language of the adults in a society is as potent a factor in the development of thinking as the child's own spontaneous formation of structures of relationships drawn from experience (1976:136).

Since a concern of integrated language arts is to foster integrative behavior in the child, the intimate relationship of language to thought must be considered as a crucial relationship among the elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

It has been suggested that the language arts have many broad and specific interrelationships. Thorn and Braun point out that the language arts can be grouped by medium—oral and written—or by function—expressive and receptive (1974:61). They classify the skills and abilities common to the expressive arts of speaking and writing as including: formulation of the idea, vocabulary, language patterns, organization, sensitivity to audience, as well as style and form. Skills and abilities regarded by Thorn and Braun as common to the receptive arts of listening and reading, are cited as word perception, and interpretation. Each of these skills in turn, is made up of subskills. According to Thorn and Braun the mastery of the skills is essential to the practice of the art (1974:102).

Although it is necessary to be totally familiar with this complex of skills and abilities, it is also of paramount importance to see them in relationship to the total act of using language for communication. A great danger lies in assuming that practice of the smallest components will be cumulative and lead to the whole. The skills and subskills of the language arts must be mastered, not for their own sake, but integrated with the total act of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and ultimately with the act of communication.

For purposes of discussion, it is necessary to distinguish among the four facets of language communication—speaking, listening, reading, and writing. One cannot conclude from these distinctions, however, that these four facets of language communication are to be separately taught. The materials of language are symbols of meanings, whether spoken, heard, written, or read. No arbitrary separation is made between them in everyday life. Mastery of the arts of communication

occurs in situations in which several or all of the phases of language are present. For this reason, the curriculum in the language arts should be so organized as to provide experiences which involve all facets of language in their normal relationships (NCTE, 1952:196).

The literature suggests that an integrated approach to language arts would organize activities to enhance the interrelatedness of the processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Although the four language arts are closely related, each of them requires certain skills which are unique to the particular process. The Alberta Elementary Language Arts Handbook, Interim Edition, speaks of specific listening and speaking skills which deal with oral language and related skills, as well as specific reading and writing skills which require the development of special visual and motor skills (1973:8).

James Moffett states that although there are specific skills unique to each of the language processes, there are many skills often included which are "general mental activities" (1968:16). Such items as recalling, comprehending, relating facts, making inferences, drawing conclusions, interpreting, and predicting outcomes are not solely language skills, but are indeed general thinking skills which may be developed in a variety of ways. The important point is that we must be extremely cautious in what we ascribe as the distinct skills in each of the language arts, and also, that regardless of the nature of the skill it must be taught in conjunction with a total communication situation.

Summary

The literature reviewed suggests that:

1. the language arts consist of four elements—listening, speaking, reading, writing.
2. communication involves not only these four verbal elements, but also many non-verbal elements such as music, dance, art, and mime, to which children should be exposed as equally valid modes of reception and expression.
3. the elements of language arts are related through thinking and through their common use of words as symbols.
4. the elements of language arts are related through common skills and abilities.
5. each element of the language arts has unique skills.

The Purposes of Integrated Language Arts

Why are we concerned with the integration of the language arts? The literature reviewed in this section suggests that the elements of language arts are the tools of communication. This critical purpose of the language arts and its implications in the daily teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing will be discussed in this section.

The teaching of specific skills must not be an end in itself. For successful integration with the process they comprise, as well as with communication in general, skills must have direct application and purpose.

Putting this at its simplest, what children use language for in school must be 'operations' and not 'dummy runs.' They must continue to use it to make sense of the world: they must practise language in the sense in which a doctor 'practises' medicine and a lawyer 'practises' law, and not in the sense in which a juggler 'practises' a new trick before he performs it (Britton, 1970:130).

The idea of children using language for operations, that is, in a functional sense, has many implications. It implies that the

teaching of specific skills must be integrated with their use in communication, and particularly with the processes to which they are related. It implies that language arts activities must have purpose, which further implies the necessity for a reason for communication, that is some form of audience. That language must be practiced in school, the way in which Britton defines practice, is also implied by his quotation.

It is rarely disputed in the literature that the primary purpose of language is communication. James A. Smith concisely summarizes many crucial ideas in the literature (Britton, Moffett, Greene and Petty, Smith et al., Logan and Logan) with respect to the purpose of language arts activities:

The language arts are the tools of communication. They are not subjects in themselves for they have no body of content. We do not read reading or write writing, or spell spelling. . . . The fundamental objective of the language arts program is to develop correct, clear, imaginative and effective communication. The full realization of this object is possible only when the tools of language are used as tools and children practice the use of them continually (1973:74-75).

The child's recognition of a need is central to developing purpose in language arts activities. The publication of the National Council of Teachers of English (1952) stresses the need for genuine purpose in language arts activities. It is suggested that communication occurs not in a vacuum, but because men are concerned with ideas, and the expression and reception of these ideas by oral and written means. "The design of the language arts curriculum should therefore be derived from those significant centers of need and interest which occasion real communication"

(NCTE, 1952:196).

Taylor (1970:24) further translates this into classroom practice by suggesting:

. . . more and more, the language arts program is being filled with activities which have current as well as future value for the student. For instance, rather than writing letters to hypothetical people, write actual letters. During this process, the student will in most cases receive valuable information or material and at the same time learn letter writing skills.

Taylor also stresses that the student must not be put in the dilemma of "going somewhere just for the sake of going." He states that goals and direction are necessary.

Smith et al. emphasize that there must be purpose in any learning, and that the purpose for learning language is to communicate (1976). From this axiom of communicative need in language learning, they suggest that "in literate societies, communicative need will play the same prime motivational role in the child's learning to read and write as it does in his learning to speak and listen with understanding" (1976:12). We use language because we need to communicate. This need is so urgent in human beings that some writers such as Cassirer and Langer (1974) have suggested that a fundamental activity of the human brain is converting experience to symbols. Purpose is central to communication, and therefore must be central to language arts activities.

Logan and Logan (1967:4) stress the relationship of communicative need to audience; "not only must the child want to communicate, he must have someone to receive his communication." Communication by its very essence, involves at least two persons, a

transmitter and a receiver. Moffett (1968:10) suggests that communication through language (discourse in Moffett's terms) involves three elements: "a first person, a second person, and a third person; a speaker, listener, and subject; informer, informed, and information; narrator, auditor, and story; transmitter, receiver, and message." One way of increasing the child's language effectiveness is to provide an ever-expanding variety of audiences; from those small and known, to those large and unknown. "When the pupil has something to say, there should be someone to listen; when he has something to write, there should be someone to read. Young people should read and listen in order to enrich what they have to say and write" (NCTE, 1952:196).

To reiterate, an integrated language arts approach recognizes that the purpose for developing the tools of language arts, listening, speaking, reading, and writing, is to facilitate clear, effective communication. Language arts activities within the school setting need to keep this general purpose in mind, while also accounting for specific goals for specific activities. Communication, in as genuine a situation as possible, should be the ever-present purpose for language arts activities, with the recognition of the fact that communication implies an audience which may be expanded from one to many.

The integrated approach to language arts places tremendous emphasis on the child as the "user" of language in the school setting.

In order to expand language there must be no artificial exercises in recitation or copying someone else's

language from the board but actual opportunities for children to use their own language to communicate. Children need the opportunity to stretch their language to the limits, to express their reactions to experiences, and to interact with each other. . . . Children can discover limitations on their language ability only if they have opportunities to use it. As communicative needs occur that they cannot meet, they will reach for more language; they will be self-motivated to expand their language (Smith et al., 1976:67).

Concern has shifted from learning isolated language rules and subject matter to using the communication skills. Petty, Petty, and Becking state that it is more important "for a child to have the skills necessary for effective expression and reception of ideas and information than to know rules about language structure, punctuation, etc." (1973:16).

James Moffett, an outspoken proponent of the idea that children must use language in school, has set down among the basic beliefs underlying his programs these axioms:

1. Rendering experience into words is the real business of school, not linguistic analysis, or literary analysis, or rhetorical analysis, which are proper subjects only for college.
2. What a student needs most of all is to perceive how he is using language and how he might use it. What this requires is awareness, not information (1968:11-12).

Moffett states emphatically that the main thesis of his book is that children should use language much more in the school setting.

The Interim Edition of the Alberta Elementary Language Arts Handbook (1973), also is strongly in favor of children expanding their language through active involvement in language-developing situations rather than through passive learning about language. This is not to suggest that there is no place in the school setting

for learning about language. Learning about language is important where it is necessary to further the child's development as a user of language. "Knowing about language and how it works is important, but only as it contributes to using language effectively" (Smith et al., 1976:75).

James A. Smith suggests that his prime objective in building effective communication skills is that "each child needs to experience language in dynamic and relevant ways all day, everyday, so he can communicate comfortably in every way open to him, and without unnecessary pressures" (1973:37).

These writers have placed great emphasis on the desirability of children increasing language arts skills through use. The stress is on a synthetic approach to language arts activities, rather than on an analytic approach. Synthesis involves the integration of the skills of language arts, as well as the processes themselves, listening, speaking, reading, writing, with the general goal being increasingly effective communication. Since children learn language initially in a synthetic manner, immersed in a total language situation where they must sort out particular aspects and form associations, it seems plausible that this method may be most suitable for language development in the school situation, where focussing on particular aspects would occur only when the child needs them to further his communication.

Summary

The literature reviewed suggested that:

1. the teaching of the elements of language arts, as well as their related skills must have purpose to be effective.
2. the purpose of language learning is communication.

3. the teaching of language arts in the school setting must involve functional practice.
4. communication implies audience and that the functional practice of language arts in the school must also recognize this.
5. children must use language if they are to master it.

The Foundations of Integrated Language Arts

James Britton, in a very sagacious comment, suggests that the school cannot afford to ignore all that has gone on in the life of the child prior to his entering school. This section reviews the literature on the elements of the child's life, prior to entering school, which have a tremendous influence on the extent of his communication skills and the teaching of the language arts.

Using language becomes a natural phenomenon to the child. Prior to entering school he probably has listened for six years, spoken for at least three years, and may have engaged in other language developing situations such as playing house, being read to, and looking at books, magazines, and papers. This accumulation of "languaging" wealth is evidence of a high degree of language competence. Many children implicitly "know" much about language. Loban's study as well as studies by Cazden (1972) indicate that even by kindergarten children are using all the basic patterns of English sentence structure. Loban found that the differences between groups of children who were rated as high or low in language ability were not in the patterns they used, but rather in the completeness and complexity of their utterances.

The implicit knowledge the child has about language can be used in a synthetic manner to build explicitly formulated ideas about language. Smith et al. suggest that "the process of language

expansion and increased effectiveness is essentially a continuation of the induction the child has been using in all his language learning since birth in which communicative need has been the prime motivating force. . . . The teaching strategy for a school program designed to expand language and improve its effectiveness is a mixed strategy of uncontrolled and controlled induction" (1976:71). The implicit knowledge (competence) of the child with respect to language can be used to build his explicit knowledge (performance) toward increasing effectiveness.

Loban's longitudinal study, previously cited, has shown that except for children whose native language was not a dialect of English, all the children in his study used all basic patterns of English sentence structure, even in kindergarten. Because the child's language learning and experience prior to entering school has been largely confined to his family, home, and immediate neighborhood, the language he brings to school may be different from "standard" English. Smith et al. point out however, that regardless of whether the child possesses a socially prestigious dialect or one considered substandard, "in all respects, the process of language learning and development is the same" (1976:47).

It has been suggested that the child's language competence is always acceptable since it is out of his control, deeply internalized and rooted in his earlier environment (Armstrong, 1976). The child's language competence is always acceptable because:

the child's language is as much a part of him as his own skin. Rejection of his language may more deeply upset him than rejection of the color of his skin.

The latter is only an insult, the former strikes at his ability to communicate and express his needs, feelings—his self (Smith et al., 1976:46-47).

Loban states that children need to learn standard English in addition to the social class dialect they know (Thorn and Braun, 1974:50). Thorn and Braun, in agreement with Loban, regard the learning of standard English in this manner:

The school's job therefore is to provide each child with the standard language that is the passport to a wide range of social and economic opportunities. But the decision to use or not use this language belongs to the individual. The person who is fluent in standard English and yet rejects its use may well be restricted to membership in certain social and occupational groups; the person who does not know standard English may often be restricted to those same groups. But there is a vital difference between restricting oneself and being restricted by ignorance of the standard language of the community (1974:50).

James Britton sees no alternative, in the initial stages, to the total acceptance of the language the child brings to school. He suggests that the development of an awareness and acceptance of differences can grow into "the habit of adapting speech to suit different purposes and occasions" (1970:135).

If in the early stages we can increase the range of a child's choice, encourage acceptance of differences and adaptability to changing situations, and at the same time leave him in unimpaired command of the speech of his home, then I believe we shall have produced the best possible foundation for all his later uses of language, including that of taking over—if and when he feels the need for it—some spoken form of standard English (1970:135).

Smith, Goodman, and Meredith stress the importance of communicative need in expanding dialects into the language of the general culture. Giving up only the language that is no longer needed and adding language to meet new needs is regarded as an

approach that may help children of divergent language backgrounds, in their acquisition of the expanded language of the general culture (1976:56).

The literature indicates that the child's language competence is an important consideration in defining an integrated approach to language arts since language is constantly changing and there are many levels of language, ranging from "illiterate" to "literary." Most of us use all levels at one time or another, depending on the social situation in which we find ourselves. The integrated language arts approach must help the child cope with these different levels, "not as criteria for determining the social status of the speaker, but as a literary style or a means of communicating a specific idea within a certain context" (Smith, 1973:84).

The ability to use with precision and appreciate with understanding the appropriate mode of language for a given purpose and in a given social situation is an extremely valuable asset. This is the essence of effective communication, the goal of the integrated language arts program. This applies not only to the use of "dialectic" variations as opposed to "standard" English, but also to the choice of whether to write a friendly letter or a business letter, a report or a poem, whether to seek information from a newspaper or an eyewitness, from an encyclopedia or a fanciful account, whether to give a speech, sing a song, or show pictures, whether to speak out, write down, draw a picture, make a play, invent a new way to express, or do nothing. These are only some of the many choices the child must learn to deal with and make if effective communication is to

occur, that is, choosing the "correct" mode of verbal or nonverbal communication for the particular purpose and situation.

Correctness may be thought of as the final step in a process that includes these steps:

- (a) overall fluency
- (b) building of a repertoire
- (c) selection for effectiveness
- (d) selection for correctness (precision) (Armstrong, 1976).

Throughout the literature on language arts, the influence of experience, as one of the foundations of the child's language development, is pervasive. Britton crystalizes the importance of experience to language development when he states, "real communication begins when the words are about experiences, ideas, and interests, which are worth putting into language" (1967:36). James Moffett echoes this sentiment in the statement, "but the stuff to be conceived and verbalized is primarily the raw stuff of life, not language matters themselves. Rendering experience into words is the real business of the school . . ." (1968:11).

The investigator has alluded to the role of experience in language development in the discussion of the diversity in language performance among children who speak dialects and those who speak standard English. The literature suggests that the child's language performance is deeply rooted in his experiences at home and within his community.

The role of experience in the early stages of language learning is self-evident. It is only the repeated association of a word with a direct experience that enables an infant to establish its meaning. Less apparent but equally important is the continued dependence of language learning on experience (Thorn and Braun, 1974:107).

Development in the language arts throughout the school years, is

dependent upon continuing and extending experiences, first hand and vicarious. The importance of new experiences resides in finding and using the appropriate language to clarify and organize the child's thinking and feeling about the experiences (Elementary Language Arts Handbook, 1973). An integrated approach to language arts must recognize the experiential base of the child's language and seek to extend and enlarge his experiences, and in conjunction with this, to increase his language ability, be it in listening, speaking, reading, or writing.

The child initially clarifies and organizes his experience through the process of speaking. "The development of both language and thought begins in many instances with talk. It is through talk—his own and others—that the child first learns to organize his environment, to interpret his experiences and to communicate with others" (Handbook, 1973:4). Britton points out that in school we cannot afford to ignore all that has gone on before, "school learning must both build upon the learning of infancy and foster something that will continue and evolve throughout adult life" (1970:129). Since oral language is the child's first, and perhaps best, avenue for receiving and communicating ideas and the one most frequently used in adult life, it seems vitally important for the school to provide a continuing program for extending the skills of speaking and listening.

It is folly to perpetuate a situation in which children are encouraged to talk (and so extend their control over both their language and their environment) during the first five years of their lives and are then cautioned, as they begin school, "Remember that you don't talk in school!" Surely, the school,

whose commission is to promote learning, cannot afford to cut off one of the most effective avenues for that learning (Thorn and Braun, 1974:114).

The school's role in perpetuating language learning through talking involves providing opportunities where children are encouraged to engage in talking for a variety of purposes and in a variety of situations. Moffett suggests that the concern of the school should be "formalizing peer talk sufficiently to provide learning of a sort that seldom occurs in casual out-of-school conversation (1968:45).

Connie Rosen conceives of "school talk" in this manner:

In some ways there is too much talk that needs pruning and trimming, and too little of the purposeful reasoning talk. The talk I am aiming for is the talk that arises from shared experiences, experiences enjoyable and interesting and yet allowing the children freedom to express themselves. Talk that will encourage comment and criticism and lead them to think about what is happening to them (Britton, 1967:28).

Britton views one of the most important functions of school talk and talk at all stages as that of creating a personal context for new experiences, facts and ideas.

Proficiency in the area of oral language, while valuable for clarifying, organizing, and communicating experience, is also essential as a base for the other language arts (Logan and Logan, Thorn and Braun, Britton, Smith et al.). Moffett states:

To develop their language powers the simple fact is that children must talk a lot. They must use language and use it an enormous amount. Learning to read and write will depend in large measure on the growth of oral speech (1968:45).

The interrelationships among the language arts make a sound oral language base imperative. The process of listening implies a

spoken message and Britton maintains that "talk in a participant role provides also the most efficient schooling in listening" (1970: 138). Thorn and Braun reinforce this position by stating that "The interaction between the listener and the speaker, which is part of many oral communications, requires a continual interchange of roles that leads to reinforcement of the language learning of each" (1974: 57).

As the written code is a symbolization of the sounds of the oral code, the ability to write is also based on oral language. Although an idea is recorded in writing, "the nature of the idea and its expression are dependent on the author's oral language" (Thorn and Braun, 1974:57). Thorn and Braun suggest that the idea stems from the author's experiences which he has reflected upon, individually and in relation to his other experiences. His thinking, and ultimately what he records in writing, will be influenced by the quality of his experiences and the vocabulary and language patterns he has at his disposal.

Reading is also inherently tied to oral language development, since, particularly in beginning reading, the meaning abstracted from printed symbols is viewed in terms of oral experience. Extracting meaning from the printed page requires bringing meaning to it—meaning acquired by organizing and extending experiences through oral language. Loban's longitudinal studies of children's language support the fact that children who are low in general oral language ability tend to be low in reading and writing achievements. The literature suggests that an integrated approach to language arts should consider

the importance of oral language as the base of all the language arts.

Summary

The literature reviewed suggests that:

1. the implicit knowledge that the child has in language can be used to build his explicit knowledge of language.
2. experience is one of the foundations of the child's language.
3. oral language is the base of all the language arts.

The Organization of Integrated Language Arts

The facilitation of an integrated approach to language arts involves some practical considerations in terms of classroom climate, physical arrangement of the classroom, grouping, timetabling, and integration with other subject areas. These topics, and their importance to the successful implementation of an integrated approach to the language arts, are pursued in the following section.

The language arts are a social phenomenon. Man uses language to communicate with others, for pleasure or to get things done. If the child is to use his language in lifelike communication situations, there must be interaction with others. In the school setting, language arts activities can be most effectively organized in group situations. Armstrong suggests that in the elementary school, social and oral language must never be completely replaced by individual and written language (1976). An extension of this principle of teaching language arts implies that individual, written language should always be translated into a social and oral context.

Britton regards talking and the interaction it promotes as the cornerstone of language arts. He, as others (Moffett, Thorn and Braun, Smith et al.) believes that "it is not any and all forms of

talk that are desirable, mere garrulity on the one hand being of no more value than, on the other, the rigid inquisitional question and answer that used to pass under the name of discussion'" (1967:xiii). Britton is of the opinion that the kind of "talk" interaction needed in the classroom changes as children grow older. Younger children need interactions with warm and understanding adults or older children, while at the upper elementary levels, group talk is needed.

Moffett, also an avid proponent of the merits of classroom interaction, maintains that:

Peer discussions in small groups should be a staple learning activity for all grades, allotted a large amount of time in the curriculum, and conducted with the same regularity and method that, for example the traditional reading groups are accorded during these early years (1968:47).

Moffett is of the opinion that the only way to provide individual students with an appropriate amount of language experience and feedback is to develop small-group interaction. He envisions the teacher's role as one of teaching students to teach each other. Also stressed in Moffett's approach is the idea that a good group process will provide an external model for individual inner processes:

Not only does he take unto himself the vocabulary, usage, and syntax of others and synthesize new creations out of their various styles, points of view and attitudes; he also structures his thinking into mental operations resembling the operations of the group interactions. If the group amends, challenges, elaborates, and qualifies together, each member begins to do so alone in his inner speech. This is not a proven point, but I believe that general experience bears it out (1968:46).

In this approach, Moffett stresses that group interaction must be

taught—with frequency, regularity, and method—the speech ensuing from it being a means to a real-life end.

Thorn and Braun see the importance of small group interaction in involving every child in language arts activities. They feel this concept is basic to a successful language arts program.

Interaction can and should take a variety of forms for a variety of purposes, including dialogue, small groups (maximum of six), and class discussions. This is also an opportunity to involve not only peer discussion, but child-adult and child to older or younger child interactions. The literature suggests that an integrated approach to language arts would accept the fact that small group interaction is a crucial and basic method of organizing for integration of the language arts.

In addition to the concept of small group interaction, there seems to exist in the literature other important organizational elements which are said to facilitate integration.

Despite the child's natural capacity for language and his remarkable progress in this area in a few years time, the school still must assume considerable responsibility for language development. . . . Words are meaningless to him unless they represent aspects of real or vicarious experiences. He seeks and needs opportunities to verbalize, discuss, hypothesize, synthesize. Discussion, charts, creative stories, films, recordings, excursions, and every other means at the teacher's disposal must be enlisted to enlarge the child's linguistic frame of reference (Logan, Logan, and Paterson, 1972:10).

The use of many and varied materials to facilitate development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing is necessary for several reasons. Among these, the fact that variety in experiences, which includes materials and methods used in the classroom, will

demand that the child reach for and use a wider variety of language forms. In addition, the age of multi-media communication is upon us. "Schools are forced to compete with the teaching media outside them; the means for communication within the school must be as dynamic and as dramatic as those outside in order to get through to the child" (Smith, 1973:37).

A dynamic and dramatic classroom will provide varied materials and experiences to stimulate development in the language arts.

It will be the new ideas that give life to the language arts program, and a teacher will do well to ask himself before each class, "What's new?" Whether it is a Langston Hughes poem, an opinionated letter to the editor from the local paper, or a writing assignment based on a provocative picture, do something different! (Taylor, 1970:217)

Wall and bulletin board displays, realia, pictures, books, magazines, papers, things to talk about, invitations to guest speakers, room for children to move about, and places to work are all important aspects of organizing the classroom for integrated language arts.

The literature also suggests that an integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the language arts develop in a classroom environment characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and trust between the teacher and the children and among the children themselves. Although it may be said that this element characterizes any effective classroom, regardless of the subject matter, a case can be made for its particular relevance to language arts. Literature which indicates the intense proximity of language to the self identity

has been previously cited. If a child's language performance is not accepted and valued, it may be that the child himself will not feel accepted and valued. The teacher has the primary role in creating a climate of acceptance and value, since he acts as a powerful model for the attitudes and behaviors of the children. In the area of language arts it is particularly important that respect, acceptance, and trust prevail since increasing the effectiveness of communication is the essence of language arts. "A good language arts program cannot prevail where children feel intimidated, are isolated, and are reluctant to express themselves" (Rubin, 1975:13).

Giving the child a feeling of self-confidence and worth should precede instruction in the language arts. In other words, the reinforcement of ideas should come prior to any specific instruction or correction.

. . . the teacher must value and appreciate the language of each and every child. The child must not feel that his language is considered bad. The teacher must not just tolerate it, the teacher must cherish it, making the child feel pride and confidence in his language and his ability to express himself in language (Smith et al., 1976:66).

Integrating the language arts holds some implicit assumptions regarding the organization of the school day.

If we attempt to divide the Language Arts into rigid time allotments for listening, reading, speaking, language skills, composition, spelling and handwriting, we are in danger of isolating skills and giving children a false picture of the various components of the Language Arts. In effective teaching, it will be necessary on some days for teachers to use a greater part of the Language Arts time for listening; another day, for reading; another day, for composition (Province of British Columbia, A Guide to Teaching the English Language Arts in the Intermediate Years, 1968:208).

In effect, this means that to facilitate the flexible nature of an integrated approach to language arts, generous and flexible time allotments are necessary (Greene and Petty, 1975:62). Taylor sees the advantages of longer class periods as including fuller development and more careful teaching of concepts, more time for individual and group work, and more time for developing longer assignments such as plays and writing newspapers (1970:206).

Crucial to the facilitation of the integrated language arts approach is the recognition that no aspect of language arts must be taught in isolation. Generous and flexible time allotments allow the teacher and students the time to integrate skills and activities in purposeful communication.

Perhaps one of the most basic and powerful ideas associated with the concept of integrated language arts concerns what Moffett has termed the differentiation among "kinds and orders of knowledge" (1968:6). He suggests that English, mathematics, and foreign languages can be differentiated from the empirical subjects such as history and biology because the former are not about themselves in the same manner as are the latter. "English, French, and mathematics are symbol systems, into which the phenomenal data of empirical subjects are cast and by means of which we think about them. Symbol systems are not primarily about themselves; they are about other subjects" (1968:6). Moffett feels strongly about the importance of separating, in the curriculum and in the student's mind, the symbolic systems from the empirical subjects in order that the student can then discover "both the dependence and independence of one and the other" (1968:9).

Greene and Petty recommend that in organizing subject matter to facilitate Moffett's idea of differentiating between the symbol system and the content, a functional and integrated program be utilized (1975:59). They suggest that this type of approach is functional in that it focusses upon children's language arts experiences, and is integrated in that what children write, speak or read about and listen to is derived largely from other curricular areas. Greene and Petty reinforce the idea that integration with other curricular areas must never be forced or artificial and that such an approach does not eliminate the teaching of specific skills, attitudes, and knowledge when needed. The objective should be "to get away from the formalized and isolated teaching of subject matter which too often ignores children's abilities, needs, and interests" (1975:59).

Every child must learn that the language skills are the tools by which he receives and transmits ideas and information about all his daily activities, in school and out. These activities are the content around which a successful language arts program operates. Thus, the language skills can be integrated with every area of the school curriculum—and they should be at every natural opportunity (Greene and Petty, 1975:60).

The responsibility for teaching children how to operate the symbol system of language belongs to every teacher, regardless of the subject matter he teaches. "As someone has said, 'Teaching children to use their language effectively is too important to be left only on the English teacher'" (Greene and Petty, 1975:58).

Summary

The literature reviewed suggests that:

1. integrated language arts activities must be organized to promote interaction, particularly small group peer interaction.

2. the use of many and varied materials is an essential organizational element of integrated language arts.
3. language arts develops in a classroom environment characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and trust.
4. integrated language arts is facilitated by a school day so organized as to provide generous and flexible time allotments.
5. an integrated language arts approach recognizes that language is a symbol system through which most other subjects are learned, and that the curriculum should be so organized as to account for this fact.

CONCLUSION

The literature on the "language arts" is virtually endless. There are innumerable texts dealing specifically with each of the four elements, listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as well as those dealing collectively with the four elements. It is obvious that the teaching of language arts is held in high value, but approaches, methods, and materials are varied.

Over the years, the process called integration has generally meant a concern with presenting knowledge in such a manner that it would "find coherent form in the life of the learner" (Maxwell, 1968:53). Combining listening, speaking, reading, and writing under the rubric of language arts was one attempt at integrating English. We have now recognized that the goal has been missed and the result is integrated language arts, another attempt to make the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing more effective. "More effective" should be defined in relation to the learner and his increasingly more effective ability to use language in all its facets to meet his communication needs.

In 1940, Washburne stated, "the point is that learning is an integrated act and is effective in proportion to the degree of

relationship that any one element of learning has to other elements and to one's total experiences" (275). In 1968, Maxwell stated, "admitting that we cannot integrate learning for the learner, since this is something which he must do for himself, the classroom quest is to organize the bits and pieces so that the learner sees the inner unity of the thing called English" (57). In 1974, Robertson stated, "this integrating is an internal personal process. Teachers cannot do it for their pupils; pupils must do it for themselves" (41). Integration of learning experiences within the individual learner is fundamental to the concept of integrated language arts. Until it is recognized that integration is an internal process and that language is a symbol system which children must be taught not only how to describe, but how to operate, integration in the language arts will not occur.

The literature presented here has attempted to elucidate some of the fundamental ideas which may help the teacher provide language arts experiences in such a way that the child will find it easier to integrate them with his personal experience and give him a more effective way of dealing with his future experiences.

Chapter 3

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The objectives of this study were to establish a set of criteria to define an integrated approach to language arts and to validate these criteria through the ratings and comments of two selected expert groups. "Expert" groups were required in order to assure some degree of familiarity with the concepts and terminology presented in the criteria.

To accomplish the objectives as stated above, an instrument was constructed in the form of a questionnaire containing seventeen criteria synthesized from the related literature. This was then administered to the two expert groups and later tallied to obtain the results. This chapter will deal with further explanations of the methods used in conducting the study.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

Development of the Criteria

It was felt by the investigator that there seemed to be a lack of statements defining what constituted an integrated approach to language arts. Since integration is not a new concept in educational literature and has also been discussed with specific reference to the language arts, the investigator felt it would be justified to turn to the literature in an attempt to synthesize a body of

statements that would potentially define an integrated approach to the language arts.

Both current and earlier literature on language arts and related topics were reviewed by the investigator. Themes or principles relating to integration in the language arts were noted. These were included in the summary at the end of each section in Chapter 2. From the summary at the end of each section the following criteria were synthesized:

The Elements of Integrated Language Arts

1. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that language development involves the receptive arts of listening and reading, and the expressive arts of speaking and writing.
2. An integrated approach to language arts organizes language arts activities in order to enhance the interrelatedness of the processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
3. An integrated approach to language arts attempts to provide children with many different modes for receiving and expressing in the language arts.
4. An integrated approach to language arts utilizes separate, though not isolated, periods to develop specific mechanical skills, as well as integrated experiences to facilitate the common elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The Purposes of Integrated Language Arts

1. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of purpose to a communication situation in language arts activities.
2. An integrated approach to language arts stresses language development through the use and practise of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
3. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of audience to a communication situation and encourages a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes.
4. An integrated approach to language arts considers the language arts in terms of the appropriateness and precision of a given mode for a given purpose and situation.

The Foundations of Integrated Language Arts

1. An integrated approach to language arts uses the implicit knowledge about language which the child has to build explicit, formulated ideas about language.
2. An integrated approach to language arts accepts the fact that all children have achieved a high degree of language competence in at least one dialect by the time they come to school.
3. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the oral language base of all of the language arts.
4. An integrated approach to language arts begins with the present experience and competence of the child in language.

The Organization of Integrated Language Arts

1. An integrated approach to language arts stresses child-child interaction in dialogue, groups, and class discussion.
2. An integrated approach to language arts uses many and varied materials to facilitate development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
3. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the language arts develop in a classroom environment characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and trust by teachers and peers.
4. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that flexible time allotments are necessary for integration of the language arts.
5. An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the processes and skills of the language arts are also modes of communication in other subjects.

The final seventeen criteria were seen by the investigator as being the reoccurring themes or principles in the literature searched.

These seventeen criteria became the basis for the instrument which was constructed to obtain the ratings of the two expert groups.

The Instrument

The instrument took the form of a survey questionnaire. Each criterion was stated in the survey questionnaire in the form of a Reaction Statement, an Explanation Statement, and a Practical Application Statement. In this way, the essence of each criterion was stated in three different forms.

The Reaction Statement conveyed the principle or criterion to

which the respondents were to react. The Explanation attempted to expand briefly and clarify the intention of the principle, and the Practical Application attempted to bring the principle to a still more concrete level by suggesting what that principle would mean in terms of classroom practice. The Reaction Statements were the criteria taken from the above list. The Explanation and Practical Application statements were developed from the literature as extensions of the criteria. The statements were reviewed by three qualified professors in order to verify the interrelationships among the Reaction Statement, Explanation, and Practical Explanation for each criterion. In the survey questionnaire, the criteria were randomly arranged, and the Reaction Statements were followed by the Explanation and Practical Application statements respectively.

The front cover page of the questionnaire asked respondents to assist in validating the criteria by rating each one in light of what they believed to constitute an integrated approach to language arts. The instructions directed the respondent to READ each Reaction Statement together with its accompanying Explanation and Practical Application, and then to RATE each criterion as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate* to his ideas of an integrated language arts approach by placing a check mark in the spaces provided to the right of the Reaction Statement.

The directions on the front cover page encouraged the respondent to REACT to the criteria further by adding any criteria which he felt may have been neglected and by commenting on any of the criteria as stated in the survey. Space was left for this at

the end of the questionnaire.

There was also space provided for the respondent to identify himself as a classroom teacher, including grade taught, or to specify the nature of his position if classroom teacher was not applicable. This was the only form of identification of the respondents used on the questionnaire.

The entire survey questionnaire, including the front cover page containing a brief explanation of the study and directions to the respondents, was seven pages in length (see Appendix A).

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The second purpose of the study was to validate the criteria synthesized from the literature through the ratings of two expert groups, an instructional group, and a non-instructional group. The use of "expert" groups was seen as a necessity if the validation of the criteria was to be meaningful. The expertise of the respondents in the area of language arts would enable them to make qualified judgements with respect to the appropriateness of the criteria.

The ratings of an instructional group and a non-instructional group were seen as a means of sampling both theoretical and practical points of view on integration. The use of two such groups would also make comparisons of their ratings possible to determine any areas of divergence in perceptions on what constitutes an integrated approach to language arts.

The population for the study involved instructional and non-instructional experts from the Edmonton Public School Board, the

Edmonton Separate School Board, the County of Strathcona School System, the St. Albert Protestant Separate School Board, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, and Alberta Education.

The sample for the instructional group was identified by the particular school board, according to the teacher selection criteria outlined below:

- (a) expresses willingness to complete a brief questionnaire, rating a set of defining criteria on integrated language arts.
- (b) has a minimum of two years teaching experience.
- (c) teaches any grade between or including grades one and six.
- (d) teaches language arts on a regular basis in a normal classroom.
- (e) is viewed by supervisors as a successful language arts teacher.
- (f) has a minimum of three years training in Education

OR

has at least two university courses in curriculum and instruction in reading and/or language.

The investigator contacted the teachers by telephone to explain the study and confirm their willingness to participate in the survey.

Forty-seven teachers were identified.

The nature of the non-instructional group limited the population from which to draw respondents. The sample of non-instructional experts was identified by the investigator in the case of Alberta Education personnel and University of Alberta professors. School supervisory personnel were identified by the school boards. School board consultants were identified by the investigator, except in one case where the board provided the names. Twenty-three non-instructional personnel were identified.

The following chart indicates the number and types of experts included in the sample:

<u>Instructional</u>		<u>Non-instructional</u>	
Division I teachers	22	Professors	6
Division II teachers	17	Alberta Education	
		personnel	2
		Consultants	6
		School supervisory	
		personnel	6

ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

Administration

The people suggested by the school boards and those identified by the investigator were contacted by telephone. At this time, the investigator briefly explained the nature of the study and confirmed the willingness of the respondents to participate in the survey. None of the people contacted were unwilling to participate in the study. In all cases of the non-instructional group, the investigator spoke directly to the respondent. In some cases of the instructional group, the investigator spoke to the principal of the school rather than directly to the teacher respondents.

The surveys were personally delivered to the respondents, enclosed in a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return to the investigator. Where possible, the investigator spoke directly to the respondents as the survey was delivered.

Of 23 survey questionnaires delivered to the non-instructional expert group, 21 were returned. Of these, 20 were available for scoring purposes, the one remaining survey being omitted due to the omission by the respondent of an entire page.

Of 47 survey questionnaires delivered to the instructional expert group, 41 were returned. Of these, 39 were suitable

for scoring purposes, the remaining two being omitted due to the omission by the respondents of an entire page.

Scoring

As the returned survey questionnaires were received by the investigator, they were designated into two main groups, instructional and non-instructional. The instructional group was further divided into Division I (Grades 1, 2, 3) and Division II (Grades 4, 5, 6) categories. There were 22 respondents in the instructional Division I group and 17 in the instructional Division II group.

Scoring of the returned questionnaires involved tallying the number of responses in each of the categories, that is, *highly appropriate, appropriate, undecided, inappropriate, highly inappropriate*, for each of the above described groups. In addition, tallies were recorded for the Total Instructional group consisting of Division I plus Division II respondents, and for the Grand Total group, non-instructional plus total instructional respondents. This meant tallies were recorded for a total of five groups, these being: the Division I respondents, the Division II respondents, the Total Instructional group (Division I plus Division II), the Non-instructional respondents, and the Grand Total group (Total Instructional group plus Non-instructional group).

The tallies were then converted to percentages by adding the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* totals for any given group and taking this number out of the total number of that group who responded to the item. Omitting the item was not considered a response.

A criterion was considered validated by a particular group

if the *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses for that item were 80% or more of the total responses made by the particular group, to the item.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Quantitative analysis of the data was done to determine which criteria were validated by the particular groups. Qualitative analysis of the comments made by the respondents was also performed to determine any explanation of the quantitative results and any further insights into the groups' perceptions about integrated language arts. The qualitative analysis involved listing the comments made pertinent to each criterion and scrutinizing these to determine whether or not any commonalities could be found from which generalizations could be drawn.

SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed in detail the procedures used in the development, administration, and scoring of the instrument used in the study. The instrument was developed as part of a two-step process of establishing and validating a set of criteria to define an integrated approach to the language arts. The seventeen criteria which comprised the instrument were synthesized from the related literature. Two expert groups were administered the instrument and requested to rate each criterion as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate* to their ideas of an integrated approach to language arts. An explanation of the

scoring procedures was also included.

Appendix A contains a replica of the instrument as presented to the two expert groups.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss the analysis and summary of findings related to the data collected from the survey of instructional and non-instructional experts. The data were obtained from the previously described questionnaire in which the two expert groups were asked to rate a set of 17 criteria, seen by the investigator as being reoccurring themes in the literature, as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate* according to their ideas of an integrated language arts approach. Space was provided on the questionnaire for the respondents to add any further criteria and to comment on the stated criteria.

The data collected, as described above, were analyzed in two ways. The quantitative analysis involved tallying the ratings of the two expert groups and converting these to percentages. The qualitative analysis was comprised of recording the comments made by the two expert groups and analyzing them in an attempt to elucidate the quantitative findings. The quantitative and qualitative analyses will be discussed first, followed by the findings, reported on a criterial basis.

THE ANALYSES

Quantitative Analysis

The Groups

To facilitate the analysis and interpretations of the findings, the two expert groups were subdivided in the following manner:

<u>Group</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Instructional-Division I	22
Instructional-Division II	<u>17</u>
Instructional-Total	39
Non-instructional Total	<u>20</u>
Grand Total	59

The Instructional-Division I group was composed of those respondents teaching at the grade one, two, and three levels, while the Instructional-Division II group was composed of those respondents teaching at the grade four, five, and six levels. The Instructional-Total group was a combination of the Division I and Division II groups. The Non-instructional group was not subdivided. This group, together with the Instructional-Total group comprised the Grand Total group.

Tallying the Responses

Totals were obtained for each criterion by tallying the check marks made by the respondents in each of the five groups, in each of the categories, *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, and *highly inappropriate*. Table 1 contains the total number of responses in each category for each of the five groups, for the

Table 1

Tallies for Each Group for Each Item

Item #1	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	19	3	0	0	0	0
I-2	14	3	0	0	0	0
I-T	33	6	0	0	0	0
N-I	18	1	1	0	0	0
G-T	51	7	1	0	0	0

Item #2	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	16	5	0	1	0	0
I-2	7	9	1	0	0	0
I-T	23	14	1	1	0	0
N-I	15	2	3	0	0	0
G-T	38	16	4	1	0	0

Item #3	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	10	7	0	4	1	0
I-2	1	11	4	1	0	0
I-T	11	18	4	5	1	0
N-I	9	8	0	0	1	2
G-T	20	26	4	5	2	2

Item #4	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	6	8	1	2	4	1
I-2	0	12	3	1	0	1
I-T	6	20	4	3	4	2
N-I	8	7	2	2	0	1
G-T	14	27	6	5	4	3

Item #5	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	17	5	0	0	0	0
I-2	14	3	0	0	0	0
I-T	31	8	0	0	0	0
N-I	17	3	0	0	0	0
G-T	48	11	0	0	0	0

Item #6	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	14	7	0	1	0	0
I-2	11	5	0	1	0	0
I-T	25	12	0	2	0	0
N-I	10	9	0	0	0	1
G-T	35	21	0	2	0	1

Item #7	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	12	10	0	0	0	0
I-2	11	5	1	0	0	0
I-T	23	15	1	0	0	0
N-I	11	7	1	1	0	0
G-T	34	22	2	1	0	0

Item #8	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	10	11	0	1	0	0
I-2	6	10	1	0	0	0
I-T	16	21	1	1	0	0
N-I	13	6	1	0	0	0
G-T	29	27	2	1	0	0

Item #9	h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
I-1	16	6	0	0	0	0
I-2	15	2	0	0	0	0
I-T	31	8	0	0	0	0
N-I	16	3	1	0	0	0
G-T	47	11	1	0	0	0

Table 1 (Continued)

Item #10					Item #11					Item #12				
	h.a	a	u	i h.i o		h.a	a	u	i h.i o		h.a	a	u	i h.i o
I-1	12	10	0	0 0 0	I-1	10	11	0	1 0 0	I-1	11	10	0	1 0 0
I-2	9	6	2	0 0 0	I-2	7	9	1	0 0 0	I-2	7	7	2	1 0 0
I-T	21	16	2	0 0 0	I-T	17	20	1	1 0 0	I-T	18	17	2	2 0 0
N-I	16	4	0	0 0 0	N-I	14	5	1	0 0 0	N-I	14	4	2	0 0 0
G-T	37	20	2	0 0 0	G-T	31	25	2	1 0 0	G-T	32	21	4	2 0 0

Item #13					Item #14					Item #15				
	h.a	a	u	i h.i o		h.a	a	u	i h.i o		h.a	a	u	i h.i o
I-1	8	12	0	2 0 0	I-1	15	7	0	0 0 0	I-1	13	8	0	1 0 0
I-2	5	9	3	0 0 0	I-2	7	9	0	1 0 0	I-2	9	8	0	0 0 0
I-T	13	21	3	2 0 0	I-T	22	16	0	1 0 0	I-T	22	16	0	1 0 0
N-I	10	7	2	0 0 1	N-I	13	6	1	0 0 0	N-I	16	3	1	0 0 0
G-T	23	28	5	2 0 1	G-T	35	22	1	1 0 0	G-T	38	19	1	1 0 0

Item #16					Item #17				
	h.a	a	u	i h.i o		h.a	a	u	i h.i o
I-1	13	7	2	0 0 0	I-1	17	5	0	0 0 0
I-2	10	6	1	0 0 0	I-2	9	6	2	0 0 0
I-T	23	13	3	0 0 0	I-T	26	11	2	0 0 0
N-I	15	4	1	0 0 0	N-I	17	2	1	0 0 0
G-T	38	17	4	0 0 0	G-T	43	13	3	0 0 0

seventeen items. In the response column, the possibilities included *highly appropriate* (h.a), *appropriate* (a), *undecided* (u), *inappropriate* (i), and *highly inappropriate* (h.i). A column was also added to include the case where the respondent failed to mark any of the possibilities. This was considered by the investigator as omitted (o). The groups, as outlined above, included the Instructional-Division I (I-1), Instructional-Division II (I-2), the Instructional Total (I-T), the Non-instructional (N-I) and the Grand Total (G-T).

It may be seen from Table 1 that the majority of the responses for all of the groups occurred in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* categories. Criteria #3 and #4 received the lowest number of *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses, while also receiving the highest number of *inappropriate* and *highly inappropriate* responses. These two items were the only criteria of the seventeen included in the questionnaire to receive any responses in the *highly inappropriate* column. With the exception of Criteria #3, #4 and #7, the Non-instructional group rated none of the criteria as *inappropriate* or *highly inappropriate*. Table 2 contains a summary of the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses for the two major groups and the Grand Total group.

Converting the Tallies to Percentages

The tallies, as shown in Table 1, were then converted to percentages by adding the *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* totals for any given group and taking this number out of the total number of that group who responded to the item. Omitting the item was not considered a response. It was decided by the investigator that any

Table 2

Summary of *Highly Appropriate* and *Appropriate* Responses
for the Two Major Expert Groups

Instructional Total = 39
Non-instructional Total = 20
Grand Total = 59

Criteria	Instructional Total			Non-instructional Total			Grand Total		
	h.a	a	T	h.a	a	T	h.a	a	T
1	33	6	39	18	1	19	51	7	58
2	23	14	37	15	2	17	38	16	54
3	11	18	29	9	8	17	20	26	46
4	6	20	26	8	7	15	14	27	41
5	31	8	39	17	3	20	48	11	59
6	25	12	37	10	9	19	35	21	56
7	23	15	38	11	7	18	34	22	56
8	16	21	37	13	6	19	29	27	56
9	31	8	39	16	3	19	47	11	58
10	21	16	37	16	4	20	37	20	57
11	17	20	37	14	5	19	31	25	56
12	18	17	35	14	4	18	32	21	53
13	13	21	34	10	7	17	23	28	51
14	22	16	38	13	6	19	35	22	57
15	22	16	38	16	3	19	38	19	57
16	23	13	36	15	4	19	38	17	55
17	26	11	37	17	2	19	43	13	56

criterion in which the combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses for any group were 80% or more of the total responses to that item, would be accepted as a validated criterion to define an integrated approach to language arts for that particular group.

Table 3 shows the percentages in each category of response for each group, for each item.

Rank Order

The validated criteria were rank ordered to indicate that although sixteen of the seventeen criteria were validated by the Grand Total group, that is, the *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses to a given item were equal to or greater than 80% of the total responses to that item, there was diversity as to which items seemed to be more highly preferred.

For each criterion, the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* scores were multiplied by five and four respectively, with these corresponding to a Likert scale of points as follows:

h.a	a	u	i	h.i	o
5	4	3	2	1	0

Only the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* scores were used since the majority of the responses fell in these two categories. The two numbers obtained were then added together to secure a total number of points for that criterion. These were then rank ordered from the greatest number of points to the smallest number of points to show which criteria were most highly preferred. Table 4 indicates the rank order of validated criteria for each group, based on the number of points obtained.

Table 3

Validation Scores for Each Group for Each Item

Item	Div. I %	Div. II %	Inst. Total %	Non-inst. %	Grand Total %
#1	100	100	100	95	98
#2	95	94	95	85	92
#3	<u>77</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>74</u>	94	81
#4	<u>67</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>73</u>
#5	100	100	100	100	100
#6	95	94	95	100	97
#7	100	94	97	90	95
#8	95	94	95	95	95
#9	100	100	100	95	98
#10	100	88	95	100	97
#11	95	94	95	95	95
#12	95	82	90	90	90
#13	91	82	87	89	88
#14	100	94	97	95	97
#15	95	100	97	95	97
#16	91	94	92	95	93
#17	100	88	95	95	95

Table 4

Rank Order of Validated Criteria for Each Group

Division I Group		Division II Group		Total Instruction Group		Non-instruction Group		Grand Total Group	
Rank Order	Points	Rank Order	Points	Rank Order	Points	Rank Order	Points	Rank Order	Points
# 1	107	# 9	83	# 1	189	# 5	97	# 5	284
5	105	1	82	5	187	10	96	1	283
17	105	5	82	9	187	1	94	9	279
9	104	15	77	7	175	17	93	17	267
14	103	6	75	17	174	9	92	15	266
2	100	7	75	14	174	15	92	10	265
7	100	16	74	15	174	16	91	14	263
10	100	2	71	6	173	11	90	6	259
6	98	11	71	2	171	8	89	16	258
15	97	14	71	10	169	14	89	7	258
12	95	8	70	16	167	12	86	11	255
8	94	17	69	11	165	6	86	2	254
11	94	10	69	8	164	2	83	8	253
16	93	12	63	12	158	7	83	12	244
13	88	13	61	13	149	13	78	13	227
3	78	3	49	3	127	3	77	3	204

Qualitative Analysis

Nature of the Analysis

The qualitative analysis involved two processes. Initially, the comments specific to each criterion, the suggested additional criteria, and the general comments were listed and coded to indicate the status of the respondent as instructional or non-instructional. This made it possible to discern which criteria had elicited the most comments and by which group these had been made. The Total Instructional group was not subdivided into the Division I and Division II components due to the relatively small number of comments recorded. Table 5 contains a summary of the number of comments made by the two main groups on each item, as well as information pertaining to the number of additional criteria suggested, and the number of general comments made.

The second portion of the qualitative analysis involved scrutinizing the comments to determine whether or not any commonalities could be found from which generalizations could be drawn. It was hoped that any such generalizations would be of value in elucidating the quantitative findings, or further expanding on the reactions of the two expert groups with respect to defining an integrated approach to language arts.

An overview of the general and specific comments made by the respondents reveals that for the most part, the comments were very positive. Table 5 indicates that the majority of the comments were made by the Non-instructional group. Out of a total of 120 comments made, including additional criteria, general comments, and comments

Table 5
Number of Comments Made on Each Item by the
Two Expert Groups

Item	Instructional	Non-instructional	Total
1	1	5	6
2	1	3	4
3	3	6	9
4	1	7	8
5	0	5	5
6	0	7	7
7	0	2	2
8	1	6	7
9	0	3	3
10	0	2	2
11	1	1	2
12	2	1	3
13	1	3	4
14	0	6	6
15	1	4	5
16	3	4	7
17	2	3	5
Additional Criteria	1	8	9
General Comments	15	11	26

specific to each criterion, 73% of these were made by the Non-instructional group. Although fewer specific comments were made by the Total Instructional group, it may be seen from Table 5 that this group made a greater number of general comments than did the Non-instructional group. Comments made by the Total Instructional group tended to be shorter and less critical than the comments made by the Non-instructional group (see Appendix B for actual comments).

THE FINDINGS

The quantitative and qualitative findings are cited under each criterion. The Reaction Statement for the criterion is restated prior to the discussion of the findings for that particular item.

The following four questions were used as a guideline in reporting the findings for each criterion:

1. Which groups validated this criterion as defining an integrated approach to language arts?
2. Are there any similarities or differences in the validation of the criterion between the Non-instructional and Total Instructional groups?
3. Are there any similarities or differences in the validation of the criterion within the Total Instructional group, comprised of the Division I and Division II components?
4. Do the comments made pertaining to this criterion reveal any explanation of or further insight about the quantitative findings?

Question one was answered by analyzing the validation scores for each group for each criterion. Questions two and three were answered by examining the differences in validation scores between the various

groups, by examining the differences in numbers of *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses for each item, and by examining the rank order of items for each group. The qualitative analysis provided answers to the fourth question. The findings for each criterion are presented, followed by a discussion of the additional criteria suggested and the general comments which were made with respect to the criteria as a body of statements.

CRITERION #1 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that language development involves the receptive arts of listening and reading, and the expressive arts of speaking and writing.

This criterion was validated by the Grand Total group with the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses equalling 98% of the responses to this item. The Division I instructional group, the Division II instructional group, and the Total Instructional group, also validated Criterion #1 with the combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses being 100% of the responses to the item in all three of the groups. The Non-instructional group validated Criterion #1, with 95% of the responses to that item being in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* categories. In each of the five groups, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was much greater than the number of *appropriate* responses (see Table 6). Criterion #1 also was rank ordered in the top five criteria for each of the five groups.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made pertaining to Criterion #1 reveals a concern expressed with respect to the fact that non-verbal modes of communication were excluded as being equally

Table 6
Number of *Appropriate and Highly Appropriate* Responses
for Each Group, for Each Item

Total Instructional Group			Division I Group			Division II Group			Non-instructional Group			Grand Total Group		
Item	No. of Responses		Item	No. of Responses		Item	No. of Responses		Item	No. of Responses		Item	No. of Responses	
	h.a	a		h.a	a		h.a	a		h.a	a		h.a	a
1	33	6	1	19	3	1	14	3	1	18	1	1	51	7
2	23	14	2	16	5	*2	7	9	2	15	2	2	38	16
*3	11	18	3	10	7	*3	1	11	3	9	8	*3	20	26
*4	6	20	*4	6	8	*4	0	12	4	8	7	*4	14	27
5	31	8	5	17	5	5	14	3	5	17	3	5	48	11
6	25	12	6	14	7	6	11	5	6	10	9	6	35	21
7	23	15	7	12	10	7	11	5	7	11	7	7	34	22
*8	16	21	*8	10	11	*8	6	10	8	13	6	8	29	27
9	31	8	9	16	6	9	15	2	9	16	3	9	47	11
10	21	16	10	12	10	10	9	6	10	16	4	10	37	20
*11	17	20	*11	10	11	*11	7	9	11	14	5	11	31	25
12	18	17	12	11	10	12	7	7	12	14	4	12	32	21
*13	13	21	*13	8	12	*13	5	9	13	10	7	*13	23	28
14	22	16	14	15	7	*14	7	9	14	13	6	14	35	22
15	22	16	15	13	8	15	9	8	15	16	3	15	38	19
16	23	13	16	13	7	16	10	6	16	15	4	16	38	17
17	26	11	17	17	5	17	9	6	17	17	2	17	43	13

* Items where *highly appropriate* responses less than *appropriate* responses.

acceptable modes of receiving and expressing. While non-verbal modes were omitted here and dealt with in Criterion #14 (see Criterion #14 for discussion), it may be appropriate to reword Criterion #1 to read, "An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that communication involves the verbal receptive modes of listening and reading, the verbal expressive modes of speaking and writing, as well as non-verbal receptive modes such as viewing, touching, tasting, and non-verbal expressive modes such as art, music, dance, and mime."

CRITERION #2 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of purpose to a communication situation in language arts activities.

This criterion was validated by the Grand Total group with the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses equalling 92% of the responses to this item. The Division I instructional group, the Division II instructional group, the Total Instructional group, and the Non-instructional group also validated Criterion #2 as defining an integrated approach to language arts. There was a 10% difference between the Total Instructional group and the Non-instructional group in validating this item, with the percentages obtained being 95% and 85% respectively (see Table 7). The number of *highly appropriate* responses given to this criterion was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses in all of the groups with the exception of the Division II instructional group, where the number of *appropriate* responses given was greater than the number of *highly appropriate* (see Table 6). It is interesting that Criterion #2 was rank ordered in the bottom five criteria for the Grand Total group and also for the Non-instructional group (see Table 4, page 69).

Table 7

Items in Which Validation Scores of the Instructional
and Non-instructional Groups Differed
by 5% or More

Item	Instructional %	Non-instructional %	% Difference
1	100*	95	5
2	95*	85	<u>10</u>
3	74	94*	<u>20</u>
4	70	79*	<u>9</u>
6	95	100*	5
7	97*	90	7
9	100*	95	5
10	95	100*	5

* Group with greater validation score.

For the Non-instructional group this may be a reflection of fewer responses in the *appropriate* column. There were three *undecided* responses recorded by this group for Criterion #2.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made pertaining to Criterion #2 did not reveal any explanation for the 10% difference between the Total Instructional group and the Non-instructional group in validating this item. Qualitative analysis did reveal that two respondents felt that while this criterion was important, it was not unique to an "integrated" approach.

CRITERION #3 An integrated approach to language arts uses the implicit knowledge about language which the child has to build explicit, formulated ideas about language.

This criterion was validated by the Grand Total group, with the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses equalling 81% of the response to this item. This criterion was not validated by the Division I instructional group, the Division II instructional group, or the Total Instructional group (see Table 3, page 68). The Non-instructional group, however, did validate Criterion #3, with the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses equalling 94% of the responses to the item.

Criterion #3, dealing with the use of the child's implicit knowledge of his language to build explicit skills, produced a discrepancy in validation scores of 20% between the Total Instructional group and the Non-instructional group. The combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses of the Total Instructional group equalled only 74% of the responses. This may suggest that this criterion, or perhaps the wording of it was not as familiar or acceptable to the Total

Instructional group as it was to the Non-instructional group who gave it a validation of 94%. The 20% difference is also a result of the fact that the Total Instructional group accorded this criterion four *undecided* responses, five *inappropriate* responses, and one *highly inappropriate* response, while the Non-instructional group accorded the criterion only one *highly inappropriate* response.

The Grand Total group, the Division II group, and the Total Instructional group gave Criterion #3 fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses (see Table 6, page 74). In the Division II group, only one *highly appropriate* response was accorded this item. Interestingly, the Division I group gave the criterion more *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses, although the combined total of the responses did not meet the specification for validation.

In rank order, Criterion #3 was ranked last by each of the five groups, including the two groups which validated this item.

Qualitative analysis of the comments pertaining to Criterion #3 reveals that this item elicited more comments than any of the other criteria (see Table 5, page 71). Comments by the Non-instructional group suggested that the wording of the Explanation implied that the inductive approach was the only approach to use in teaching language. This was not intended by the investigator. There was also a reaction against the implication in the Practical Application that the child's implicit knowledge of his language was complete by school age. Again, this implication was not intended by the investigator.

Analysis of the comments made by the Total Instructional group

also revealed a strong feeling against the Practical Application. There seemed to be some misunderstanding of the terminology and of the intent of this criterion, with the Non-instructional group exhibiting greater acceptance of the item than the Total Instructional group. It may be that this greater acceptance is a reflection of the expanded knowledge possessed by the Non-instructional group in the area of children's language.

CRITERION #4 An integrated approach to language arts accepts the fact that all children have achieved a high degree of language competence in at least one dialect by the time they come to school.

This criterion was not validated by any of the five groups, that is, in no case was the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses to the item equal to or greater than 80% of the responses for a particular group. Within the Total Instructional group, the Division II group gave this item an 8% higher validation score than did the Division I group (see Table 8). There was a 9% difference in validation scores between the Total Instructional group and the Non-instructional group, with the Non-instructional group giving the higher percentage.

All of the groups, with the exception of the Non-instructional group, gave Criterion #4 fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses. The Division II group gave this item no *highly appropriate* responses. Criterion #3 and #4 were the only items to receive any responses in the *highly inappropriate* column. This criterion was rejected by all of the groups as being a valid statement to define an integrated approach to language arts.

Table 8

Items in Which Validation Scores Between the Division I
and Division II Groups Differed by 5% or More

Item	Division I %	Division II %	% Difference
3	77*	71	6
4	67	75*	8
7	100*	94	6
10	100*	88	<u>12</u>
12	95*	82	<u>13</u>
13	91*	82	<u>9</u>
14	100*	94	6
15	95	100*	5
17	100*	88	<u>12</u>

* Group with greater validation score.

Qualitative analysis of the comments pertaining to this item, indicate that in six out of seven comments made by the Non-instructional group, exception was taken to the use of the word "all" in the Reaction Statement. It would seem appropriate to replace the word "all" with the word "some."

CRITERION #5 An integrated approach to language arts stresses language development through the use and practice of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Criterion #5 was validated by the Grand Total group and also by each of the other four groups. Overwhelming agreement was shown by all of the groups on this item as shown in Table 3, page 68. All of the responses for all of the groups were recorded in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* columns, which, according to the specification for validation, gave this criterion validation scores of 100% for each of the five groups. The majority of the responses for each of the groups was recorded in the *highly appropriate* column.

Criterion #5 was rank-ordered in the top five criteria for all of the groups.

Qualitative analysis revealed that no comments were made pertaining to this criterion by the Total Instructional group. Comments by the Non-instructional group suggested that Criterion #5 was closely related to Criterion #1. The emphasis in #5 was intended to be on the words use and practice, to distinguish it from #1, where the intention was simply to indicate the elements of integrated language arts.

CRITERION #6 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the oral language base of all of the language arts.

Criterion #6 was validated by the Grand Total group and also by each of the other four groups. All responses of the Non-instructional group were recorded in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* columns, giving this criterion a validation score of 100% for the Non-instructional group. It is of interest to note that the number of *highly appropriate* responses and the number of *appropriate* responses given by the Non-instructional group were almost equal (see Table 6, page 74). This would account for Criterion #6 being low in rank order for the Non-instructional group since rank order scores were obtained by multiplying the number of *highly appropriate* responses by five and the number of *appropriate* responses by four, then adding the results. In each of the groups, including the Non-instructional group, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses.

No comments were made with respect to Criterion #6 by the Total Instructional group. Several comments were made by the Non-instructional group which proved inconclusive for purposes of drawing any generalizations. These included a query regarding whether or not oral language continues to be the base of the language arts in upper elementary, and a comment that aural aspects should also be included in this criterion.

CRITERION #7 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of audience to a communication situation and encourages a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes.

This criterion was validated as defining an integrated

approach to language arts by the Grand Total group as well as by each of the other four groups. There was a difference of 6% in the validation scores of the Division I and Division II groups, with the Division I group recording the higher percentage (see Table 8, page 80). There was also a 7% difference between the validation scores of the Total Instructional group and the Non-instructional group, with the Total Instructional group recording the higher percentage (see Table 7, page 76).

All of the responses recorded by the Division I group were located in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* columns, giving this group a validation score of 100% for Criterion #7. All of the groups gave this item a greater number of *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses.

For the Non-instructional group, Criterion #7 was ranked in the bottom five criteria, while in the Total Instructional group this item was ranked second from the top. This supports the earlier findings where the validation score for the Non-instructional group was found to be 7% lower than the score recorded by the Total Instructional group, and suggests that Criterion #7 was considered more favorable by the Total Instructional group than by the Non-instructional group.

There were no comments made by the Total Instructional group pertaining to this criterion, and only two comments were recorded for the Non-instructional group.

CRITERION #8 An integrated approach to language arts stresses child-child interaction in dialogue, groups, and class discussions.

This criterion was validated by the Grand Total group with the validation score equalling 95%. Identical validation scores were recorded by the Division I group, the Total Instructional group, and the Non-instructional group. Criterion #8 was also validated by the Division II group with a score of 94%.

Although this criterion was given high validation scores, interesting variations are revealed by comparisons of the number of *highly appropriate* responses and *appropriate* responses (see Table 6, page 74). For the Total Instructional group, the Division I group, and the Division II group, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was less than the number of *appropriate* responses, while for the Non-instructional group, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses. The greater number of *appropriate* responses recorded for the instructional groups explains the low position Criterion #8 obtained in the rank order columns.

The Division I group, the Division II group, and the Total Instructional group all gave this criterion fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses. Although the qualitative analysis revealed that there were no comments from any of these three groups to indicate reasons for this type of response, comments made by the Non-instructional group proved enlightening. They suggested, in four out of six comments, that the role of adults in providing oral interaction had been omitted. It would seem appropriate to modify the

criterion to include this very important role of teachers, parents, older children, and other adults.

It is interesting that the instructional groups, while validating this item, gave it fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses. Since these people are vitally and directly involved with children each day, it is possible, that while they realize the importance of such a method, they are also aware of the consequences of child-child interaction that has not been planned and conducted "with regularity and method." The teacher and children must be trained in this method if it is to succeed.

CRITERION #9 An integrated approach to language arts uses many and varied materials to facilitate development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

This criterion was validated by the Grand Total group with the validation score equalling 98%. The Division I group, the Division II group, and the Total Instructional group, recorded validation scores of 100% for Criterion #9. This item was also validated by the Non-instructional group, with a score of 95%. For all of the groups, the majority of the responses were recorded in the *highly appropriate* column (see Table 6, page 74). The rank order column reflects this finding where it is possible to see that Criterion #9 was in the top five criteria for all of the groups (see Table 4, page 69).

Qualitative analysis of the comments did not suggest any reasons for the popularity of this criterion. There were no comments made by the Total Instructional group and only three made by the Non-instructional group. This would perhaps suggest that the groups were

satisfied with this item as written.

CRITERION #10 An integrated approach to language arts organizes language arts activities in order to enhance the interrelatedness of the processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Criterion #10 was validated by all of the groups, with the Division I group and the Non-instructional group recording validation scores of 100%. There was a noticeable difference between the validation score of the Division I group and that of the Division II group. A 12% difference was in evidence, with the validation score of the Division II group equalling 88%.

The nature of item #10 may explain the greater percentage given by the Division I respondents, since action on this criterion would necessitate that a class be taught by one teacher, or that planning and coordination of subjects take place where more than one teacher was involved. At the Division II level, a class is often taught by several different teachers, with time and motivational factors frequently preventing such planning and coordination of subjects.

The number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses for all groups, with the exception of the Division II group, where the numbers were equal. The rank order columns indicate divergence, with the Non-instructional group ranking Criterion #10 second from the top, and the Division II group ranking this item in the bottom five criteria.

A qualitative comment made by a member of the Non-instructional group, suggested the importance of this criterion to an integrated

approach and the necessity for deliberate and specific organization to facilitate the interrelatedness of the elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This provides an area for further research.

CRITERION #11 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the language arts develop in a classroom environment characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and trust by teachers and peers.

Criterion #11 was validated by all of the groups, with the Division I group, Instructional Total group, Non-instructional group, and Grand Total group recording identical validation scores of 95%. The Division II validation score was 94%.

Each of the instructional groups accorded this criterion slightly fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses (see Table 6, page 74). For the Non-instructional group, the majority of the responses were recorded in the *highly appropriate* column.

Only two comments were recorded pertaining to Criterion #11, and these did not provide any explanations or generalizations. It is possible that this item was viewed by teachers as a very general statement which could be applied to any learning situation, in which case they may have checked it as *appropriate* rather than *highly appropriate* in terms of defining an integrated approach to language arts. The Non-instructional group may have been more familiar with the intricate relationships between language and self-identity, and therefore would see this item as *highly appropriate* more readily than would the Total Instructional group.

CRITERION #12 An integrated approach to language arts begins with the present experience and competence of the child in language.

This criterion was validated by each of the five groups, with the Total Instructional group, the Non-instructional group, and the Grand Total group recording identical validation scores of 90%, that is, for each of these groups the number of *highly appropriate* plus *appropriate* responses equalled 90% of the total responses to that item, by that group. While both the Division I group and the Division II group also validated this criterion, there was a 13% difference between the two groups in the validation score, with the Division I score equalling 95% of the total responses and the Division II score equalling 82% of the total responses.

The instructional groups recorded almost equal numbers of *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses to this criterion. The majority of the responses of the Non-instructional group were *highly appropriate*.

The comments made pertaining to Criterion #12 did not suggest any explanation for the difference in validation scores between the Division I and Division II groups. It is possible that respondents in the Division II group viewed this item as more appropriate to the beginning years of school, although, an integrated approach to language arts stresses the importance of working with children, at all grades, from their present level of language competence, be it below or above the grade level expectancy.

CRITERION #13 An integrated approach to language arts considers the language arts in terms of the appropriateness and precision of a given mode for a given purpose and situation.

This criterion was validated by all of the groups, although the validation scores tended generally to be lower than those recorded for the other validated criteria (see Table 3, page 68). A 9% difference was produced by Criterion #13 between the Division I and Division II groups, with the validation scores being 91% and 82%, respectively. The number of *highly appropriate* responses was less than the number of *appropriate* responses for all of the groups, with the exception of the Non-instructional group. Criteria #13 was ranked in the second last position for all of the groups.

Comments on this criterion reveal no reason for its apparent unpopularity. It is possible that this item was seen as an extension of Criterion #2, although the emphasis in Criterion #13 was on the word appropriateness, rather than on the word purpose as in #2. The use of the word precision in Criterion #13 may also have affected the response, however, use of the word was not intended to indicate inflexibility. The investigator would suggest that perhaps the terminology and wording of this item made it unclear in the minds of many of the respondents. It is also possible that the results reflect the current relaxed standards of English usage.

CRITERION #14 An integrated approach to language arts attempts to provide children with many different modes for receiving and expressing in the language arts.

Criterion #14 was validated by each of the five groups, with the Division I group recording a validation score of 100%. The

Division II group produced a validation score of 94%, 6% less than that of the Division I group. With the exception of the Division II group, in each of the other groups the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses.

The qualitative analysis indicated no comments from the Total Instructional group pertaining to this item. Comments made by the Non-instructional group seemed to be related to the confusion felt by the exclusion of non-verbal modes of receiving and expressing from the Reaction Statement in Criterion #1. The distinction must be made as to what comprises "language." In the view of the investigator, communication can be verbal (language) or non-verbal. Both verbal and non-verbal modes are equally acceptable forms of communication if they are suitable to the purpose and setting of the communication. It is crucial that children become familiar with as many modes of communication as possible and learn to receive and express in these modes when it is suitable to do so. The "language" arts include the four processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The non-verbal modes should remain distinct from the language modes, for they are dependent on a different form of presentation. However, an integrated language arts approach much recognize both forms of communication, and ensure that children become familiar with as many modes as possible. Comments pertaining to Criterion #14 seem to be attempting to clarify this idea, which was not stated clearly in Criteria #1 and #14.

CRITERION #15 An integrated approach to language arts utilizes separate, though not isolated, periods to develop specific mechanical skills, as well as integrated experiences to facilitate the common elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

This criterion was validated by each of the five groups.

The Division II group recorded a validation score of 100%, that is all of the responses to this item for the Division II group were entered in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* columns. The number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses for all of the groups.

It was not possible to reach any generalizations from the comments relating to Criteria #15 (see Appendix B for actual comments).

CRITERION #16 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that flexible time allotments are necessary for integration of the language arts.

Each of the five groups validated Criterion #16. No large discrepancies in validation scores within or between the groups were apparent (see Table 3, page 68). In all cases, the number of *highly appropriate* responses recorded for each group was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses. This item was rank-ordered in the third last position by the Division I group, and was centrally placed by each of the other groups.

Criterion #16 elicited three comments from the Total Instructional group and four comments from the Non-instructional group. There was a concern expressed by the Total Instructional group with respect to the problems of length of the language arts time, grouping, and working on a flexible time schedule when there are pressures from

other subject areas—valid concerns in the implementation of an integrated language arts program.

CRITERION #17 An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the processes and skills of the language arts are also modes of communication in other subjects.

This criterion was validated by each of the five groups, with the Total Instructional group, the Non-instructional group, and the Grand Total group recording identical validation scores of 95%. Divergence occurred between the Division I group and the Division II group, where there was a difference of 12% in the validation scores, these being 100% and 88%, respectively. In all cases, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses. With the exception of the Division II group, Criterion #17 was in the top five ranked criteria.

Qualitative analysis of comments made concerning Criterion #17 suggest that the Non-instructional group accorded considerable importance to this principle in defining an integrated approach to language arts (see Appendix B for actual comments). One comment, made by a member of the Total Instructional group, suggested that implementation of the concept involved in Criterion #17 would require intra-school group planning and communication, since in the Division II areas, and sometimes in the Division I areas, there are subject exchanges among the teachers. Recall that Criterion #10 also received a lower validation score from the Division II group as compared with the Division I group, and was concerned with a principle where the same type of group planning and communication would be required. Related also, are the comments made by the Total Instructional group pertaining

to Criterion #16.

Additional Criteria

After rating the individual stated criteria, the respondents were encouraged to add further criteria which they believed had been neglected in the body of statements defining an integrated approach to the language arts. A total of eight additions were recorded for the Non-instructional group and one for the Total Instructional group.

Two of the respondents mentioned the need for some statement of the importance of the relationship between language development and thought. Although this relationship is implied in many of the criteria, and in #10 particularly, it is possible that a more specific statement should be made with respect to the importance of the relationship of thought and language to an integrated approach to language arts.

A general suggestion was made that there was a need for "critical criteria," that is, the respondent felt that many of the criteria listed could apply to any language arts program. Critical criteria would include statements of a specific nature, explaining how the various subskills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, could be integrated within and between the four elements. It was the intention of the investigator to identify a general set of criteria defining an integrated approach which could be applied to a variety of specific programs.

Other additions included a suggestion that a criterion was needed to state the importance of the teacher's training to successful implementation of an integrated language arts program. Further items

were stated which seemed to be included within the original 17 criteria (see Appendix B, Additional Criteria).

General Comments on the Criteria

The general comments on the criteria as a body of statements highlighted a number of important points. Comments by each of the two major groups were positive, with those made by the Non-instructional group being more specific and analytic than those made by the Total Instructional group. A total of 15 comments were recorded for the Total Instructional group and a total of 11 comments for the Non-instructional group.

One comment, which pinpointed a possible flaw in the instrument, suggested that it was difficult to make a decision between *highly appropriate* and *appropriate*. Following from this, it was further suggested that the initial rating of the Reaction Statement may have been changed if the respondent's interpretation of the Reaction Statement was different from that of the investigator, as illustrated by the Explanation and Practical Application.

Another revealing comment suggested that the criteria seemed to be most applicable to a program for children beginning school. The findings present evidence showing that the criteria do seem to be more highly favored by the Division I group. This may be due to the nature of the criteria themselves, or to the possibility that the organization of the language arts at the primary level is presently more compatible with an integrated language arts approach. This would be the case if the language arts were departmentalized at the Division II level, since this would not facilitate integration, unless

coordination and planning occurred among teachers.

It was further suggested in the general comments that the body of criteria did not address themselves to the "microcosm" of integration, which would involve a more specific statement of how the various subskills of each of the four processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing should be integrated within the specific process and between the four processes. Although Criteria #10 and #15 make references to this crucial area, it was not the purpose of the investigator to delineate such a microcosm, but rather to synthesize a body of general statements which would attempt to define an approach to the integration of the language arts, including these various subskills. This relates to the comment about the absence of critical criteria and is an area for further research.

Other comments made by the Total Instructional group expressed concerns with respect to implementing an integrated program when large classes and inflexible timetables prevail. One instructional respondent and one non-instructional respondent suggested that the role of reading in an integrated program was not clearly delineated by the criteria.

SUMMARY

The data obtained from the survey questionnaire were subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The findings, reported on a criterial basis, indicated that although some variations existed, there was considerable agreement among the five groups in validating the criteria as defining an integrated approach to language arts.

Following is a summary of the findings.

Validation of the Criteria

With the exception of Criteria #3 and #4, all of the criteria were validated, for each of the groups, as defining an integrated approach to language arts. Criterion #4 was not validated by any of the groups, while Criterion #3 was not validated by the Total Instructional group, the Division I group, and the Division II group, but was validated by the Non-instructional group and the Grand Total group.

Differences in Validation Scores Between the Division I and Division II Groups

There were nine criteria where the validation scores of the Division I and Division II groups differed by 5% or more. Seven of these had the greater percentage given by the Division I group (see Table 8, page 80). This may indicate that more acceptance or more awareness of the elements of integrated language arts is present at the Division I level, or perhaps that the criteria themselves were more applicable to the present organization of language arts at this level.

Differences in Validation Scores Between the Total Instructional and Non-instructional Groups

There were eight criteria where the validation scores of the Total Instructional and Non-instructional groups differed by 5% or more. Of these, three criteria elicited very noticeable differences (see Table 7, page 76). These included Criteria #2, #3, and #4 (see findings on individual criteria).

Differences Between Number of *Highly Appropriate*
and *Appropriate* Responses for Each Item

Table 6, page 74, indicates that the Non-instructional group, in each of the 17 items, gave a greater number of *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses. In contrast, the Total Instructional group gave five items fewer *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses. This suggests that the Non-instructional group found the criteria generally more *highly appropriate* to their ideas of an integrated language arts approach than did the Total Instructional group.

Interesting variations occurred within Division I and Division II groups of the Total Instructional group. Whereas the Division I group gave only four criteria fewer *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses, the Division II group gave eight criteria fewer *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses. This supports the findings earlier suggested by the differences in agreement between the two groups on validation of the criteria. It would seem that the criteria were more *highly appropriate* to the ideas of the Division I group, with respect to defining an integrated approach to language arts, than they were to the ideas of the Division II group. This may be in part due to the emphasis accorded language arts at the Division I level, compared to the Division II level.

Rank Order of the Validated Criteria

A general glance at the rank order column of the items for each group (see Table 4, page 69) reveals there are differences in rank order for each group, as well as some commonalities. Recall

that the rank order scores were obtained by multiplying the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses by points corresponding to a Likert scale. Since the number of *highly appropriate* responses was multiplied by five and the number of *appropriate* responses by four and then the two totals added to obtain the rank order score, if a criterion had fewer *highly appropriate* than *appropriate* responses it would be likely to be lower in the rank order.

Looking at the top five ranked criteria for each of the groups, it is possible to see that Criteria #1, #5, and #9 are common to all of the five groups. Criteria #17 was common to all but the Division II group. Looking at the bottom five ranked criteria for each of the groups, it may be seen that Criterion #3 was in all cases ranked last. Number 13 was ranked second from the last for all of the groups also. Criteria #8 and #12 were ranked in the bottom five by all but the Non-instructional group.

Some divergence occurred among the groups in the rank ordering. Number 17, while being in the top ranked five for the Grand Total group, the Non-instructional group, the Total Instructional group, and the Division I group, was ranked in the bottom five by the Division II group. Criterion #7 was in the top ranked five for the Total Instructional, the Division I, and the Division II groups, but not for the Grand Total group or the Non-instructional group.

The rank-ordering indicates that although 16 of the 17 statements were validated as defining an integrated approach to language arts, divergence does exist as to the relative importance of some criteria over others.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis elucidated the quantitative findings in some cases, and supported a general trend in that the Non-instructional group proved to be more vocal and analytical in their reactions to the criteria than did the Total Instructional group. This may indicate more familiarity on the part of this group with the terms and concepts involved.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

The Purpose

It was the purpose of this study to attempt to define an integrated approach to the language arts. The accomplishment of this task involved two major components.

A review of the related literature was undertaken in order to synthesize some themes or principles relating to integration in the language arts. On the basis of this information, the investigator established a set of 17 criteria which were seen as being the reoccurring themes within the literature searched.

The second component of the study involved the validation of these criteria through a sampling of "expert" opinion. The two expert groups consulted consisted of instructional and non-instructional personnel.

Sample and Design

The two expert groups were composed of 39 instructional experts who were regular classroom teachers meeting a set of teacher selection criteria, and 20 non-instructional experts who were people not directly involved in classroom teaching, but connected with the creation and implementation of language arts programs in the province of Alberta, including consultants, supervisors, University professors,

and Alberta Education personnel in the language arts area.

An instrument was designed in the form of a survey questionnaire in which the respondents were asked to assist in validating the 17 criteria. Each criterion was stated in the form of a Reaction Statement, Explanation Statement, and a Practical Application Statement. The latter two statements were included to clarify the intention of the criterion. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

The respondents were asked to rate each criterion as *highly appropriate*, *appropriate*, *undecided*, *inappropriate*, or *highly inappropriate*, according to their perceptions of an integrated language arts approach. Provision was also made for the respondents to add any criteria which they felt were not included and to comment on the criteria as stated in the survey questionnaire.

The questionnaire was delivered personally to the respondents by the investigator, enclosed in a stamped self-addressed envelope for return to the investigator. There was an 89% return of the questionnaires. For purposes of the analysis, the two expert groups were subdivided into five groups composed as follows: the Instructional Division I group consisting of those teaching at the grade one, two, or three level, the Instructional Division II group consisting of those teaching at the grade four, five, or six level, the Total Instructional group, consisting of the Division I plus Division II groups, the Non-instructional group, and the Grand Total group consisting of the Total Instructional group plus the Non-instructional group. Tallies were done for each of the groups on the number of

responses in each of the categories, for every criterion.

Quantitative analysis of the data involved converting the tallies to percentages in order to decide whether or not a particular criterion was validated for a particular group. A criterion was considered validated by a particular group, as defining an integrated approach to the language arts, when the combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses to that item were 80% or more of the total responses made to that item by the particular group. The results were examined to determine which criteria were validated by which groups, and to determine the existence of any similarities and differences within and between the groups. Qualitative analysis of comments was also done to determine any explanation of the quantitative findings.

The Findings

The findings of the study provide some answers to the questions which the study addressed in Chapter 1.

QUESTION 1: Is it possible through a synthesis of related literature to establish a set of criteria to define an integrated approach to the language arts?

It would seem that throughout the related literature on language arts there does appear a number of reoccurring themes or principles which could be said to constitute a body of general statements which define, at a certain level of generality, what might be considered to be an integrated approach to the language arts. That 16 out of the 17 statements were validated by the total expert group sampled, supports the idea that the related literature is a

valid source from which to seek statements to define an integrated approach to language arts. It appears therefore that it is possible through a synthesis of the related literature to establish a set of criteria to define an integrated approach to the language arts.

QUESTION 2: Will the criteria be validated by the ratings of two expert groups, including non-instructional and instructional respondents, as statements which in their judgement define an integrated approach to language arts?

All of the criteria but one, #4, were validated as defining an integrated approach to language arts by the total group sampled, where validation necessitated a combined *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* response of greater than or equal to 80% of the total response to that item. All of the validated criteria, as described above, were accepted by each of the five groups, except Criterion #3, which was not validated by the Division I, Division II, or Total Instructional groups. From these findings, it is clear that all of the criteria, with the exception of #4 and #3, met the requirements for validation for all of the groups. It appears therefore that in the judgement of the experts sampled, the criteria, with the above noted exceptions, were validated as statements which would define an integrated approach to language arts.

QUESTION 3: Is it possible to detect any similarities and differences in the validation of the criteria between and among the two expert groups?

The findings did indicate some interesting similarities and differences between and among the two expert groups. Considerable consistency was shown by all of the groups in validating the criteria. The majority of the validation scores were well above

the 80% specification for validation.

Minor differences were detected within the instructional group, where two subgroups were identified. These were the Division I group and the Division II group. There were nine criteria where these two groups differed 5% or more in their agreement, that is, while the criteria in question was validated by both of the groups, there was a percentage difference of equal to or greater than 5% between the two groups. In the case of the nine criteria where this 5% or greater difference occurred, there were seven criteria where the Division I group found the criteria more appropriate, as measured by the higher percentage. Differences of over 10% occurred between these two groups on Criteria #10, #12, and #17, with the higher percentage being given by the Division I group (see findings on individual criteria for comments).

Variations between the Non-instructional group and the Total Instructional group were also of a minimal nature. There were eight criteria where these two groups differed 5% or more in their validation scores, however, four of the percentage differences were exactly equal to 5%. There were only three criteria where major percentage differences occurred, these being Criteria #2, #3, and #4. The higher validation score for two of these Criteria, #3 and #4, was given by the Non-instructional group.

Differences among the five groups between the number of *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses given were also recorded. Within the instructional group, the Division I group gave a greater number of *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses in 13 of the

17 criteria, while the Division II group gave a greater number of *highly appropriate* responses than *appropriate* responses in only nine of the 17 criteria. For the Total Instructional group, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses in 12 of the 17 criteria, while for the Non-instructional group, the number of *highly appropriate* responses was greater than the number of *appropriate* responses in 17 of the 17 criteria.

Although the majority of the responses for all of the groups were recorded in the *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* columns, the above results would seem to indicate that the Non-instructional group found the criteria more *highly appropriate* than did the Total Instructional group, and that within the Total Instructional group, the Division I group found the criteria more *highly appropriate* than did the Division II group.

This type of variation among the validated criteria was further supported by the rank ordering of the criteria. Although 16 out of 17 of the criteria were validated by the total group, the rank ordering of the criteria revealed some divergence in the amount of acceptability of some criteria over others, for the total group as well as the individual groups.

Criteria #1, #5, and #9 were consistently ranked in the top five criteria for each of the groups. Criterion #3 was consistently ranked in the last position by each of the groups. Although this item was validated by the Non-instructional group and the Grand Total group, due to the low number of *highly appropriate* and *appropriate* responses recorded, Criterion #3 was rank ordered in the last position

by these groups also. Criterion #13 was consistently ranked in the second last position by each of the groups.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made by the respondents revealed a generally positive feeling toward the criteria for both the Non-instructional and Total Instructional groups. The majority of the comments were made by the Non-instructional group. Out of a total of 120 comments made, including addition of criteria, general comments, and comments specific to each criterion, 73% of these were made by the Non-instructional group. The Total Instructional group made slightly more general comments than did the Non-instructional group, while the Non-instructional group made the majority of the comments specific to each criterion. Comments made by the Non-instructional group tended to be longer and more analytical than those made by the Total Instructional group.

It appears therefore that it is possible to detect some similarities and differences in the validation of the criteria between and among the two expert groups. The major similarity in the validation of the criteria was the acceptance by the total expert group of 16 out of the 17 statements as defining an integrated approach to the language arts. Differences occurred within and between the two expert groups relating to individual items.

CONCLUSIONS

This study was an attempt to define an integrated approach to the language arts by synthesizing a set of criteria from the literature and validating these through the opinions of two expert groups.

The findings indicate that all but one of the stated criteria were found by the total expert group sampled to be valid as statements defining an integrated approach to the language arts. This set of validated statements may prove useful in further investigations into the nature of integration in the language arts.

Although 16 of the 17 criteria were validated by the total group, differences in the degree of validation within the Total Instructional group and between the Total Instructional and Non-instructional groups indicate that the individual groups may hold divergent views on certain aspects of integration in the language arts. The Non-instructional group seemed to be slightly more in favor of the criteria than the Total Instructional group, and the Division I subgroup of the Total Instructional group seemed to be more strongly in favor of the criteria than did the Division II subgroup.

The variations between the Non-instructional and the Total Instructional group may indicate that the Non-instructional group was more familiar with the terminology of the statements, or that the ideas themselves were more familiar to the Non-instructional group. This is a possibility, since the idea of integration in the language arts is a relatively recent development in terms of the jargon and concepts and would probably be more familiar to those responsible for the creation and implementation of new programs.

The differences in degree of validation between the Instructional Division I group and the Instructional Division II group may be accounted for by the greater emphasis given the language arts in the Division I area and also by the fact that timetables are less

flexible in the Division II area where subjects are often departmentalized.

The rank ordering suggests that some criteria seem to be more suitable than others for defining an integrated approach to language arts. This is particularly true of Criteria #3 and #13, which were consistently ranked in the last and second last positions respectively, for each of the groups.

Qualitative analysis of the comments made on the survey questionnaires may support the conclusion that the criteria were more familiar to the Non-instructional group, since they made the majority of the comments. Comments made by the Non-instructional group were generally longer and more analytical than those made by the Total Instructional group. Comments made by both groups were generally positive and support the fact that 16 out of the 17 criteria were validated.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

The findings of this study suggest some implications with respect to the implementation of an integrated approach to the language arts, as well as some possible uses for the set of validated criteria.

The set of validated criteria can serve as a focal point in discussing the concept of integration in the language arts. The criteria provide a set of statements which a group of experts have agreed define, at a certain level of generality, an integrated approach to the language arts. These statements can now be used as a basis for communication among various groups concerned with integration in the language arts.

Use of the criteria in researching, developing, and evaluating new language arts programs is also a possibility. In the area of curriculum development, the criteria may prove to be useful as a general starting point from which to analyze the more specific aspects of integration in the language arts.

The validated criteria may also be useful in preservice and inservice work with teachers, where they may serve as a basis for initial communication and further exploration on the topic of integrated language arts.

The use of the criteria in communicating to external groups, such as parents, and in the evaluating of pupil progress in language arts are areas which could be investigated.

Implications for education may be drawn from the findings of the study. Differences in the degree of validation of some of the criteria between the Non-instructional and Total Instructional groups may suggest that since teachers seemed to be slightly less familiar with the terms and ideas expressed as defining an integrated approach to the language arts, there may be a need for teacher education in the form of workshops and inservice education, prior to the implementation of an integrated language arts program. It would prove interesting to replicate this study with teachers given such inservice education and again compare the two expert groups.

A further implication of this study, with respect to the differences in validation of the criteria between the Division I and Division II groups, suggests that the Division I setting and philosophy may be more conducive to promoting the integration of the communication

skills. This implies a need to re-evaluate the setting and philosophy behind the Division II, and by extension the Junior and Senior High school, teaching of the communication skills. It may be that the departmentalizing of subject matter and the decreasing emphasis on language as the tool of communication in all subjects is detrimental to the concept of integrated communication skills. The differences between the Division I and Division II groups may also suggest that teachers at the Division II level will require increased attention in inservice education programs and in planning for integrated language arts.

Implications specific to several of the criteria also arise from the study. Criterion #8, indicating the need for oral interaction in the classroom, was not as highly accepted by the instructional groups as were many of the other criteria. It was suggested that this may have been due to the pedagogical difficulties of accomplishing profitable child-child interaction. It would seem necessary that both teachers and students be trained in methods of profitable oral interaction. This implies a definite need for inservice work for teachers, as well as suggesting an area that requires further research into defining what constitutes successful procedures for conducting discussion in the classroom.

Comments on Criterion #10, as well as several general comments regarding the need for "critical" criteria and identification of the "microcosm" of integration in the language arts, may indicate that both non-instructional and instructional groups are groping for the specific and deliberate ways in which to organize the language arts

in order to promote integration. This implies that there is much work yet to be done in identifying how the various subskills of the language arts can be integrated within the particular element and among the four elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

SUGGETIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Many interesting possibilities for further research are suggested by this study.

It would prove challenging to undertake a replication of Rankin's 1928 study in an attempt to determine the relative amounts of time now spent in school on the various aspects of communication as compared to the use of these same aspects in the course of daily life.

A replication of this study, employing an expert group of instructional personnel who had participated in inservice training on the concepts of an integrated language arts approach, would provide data on the effectiveness of such programs in decreasing the gap between the creators of programs and the actual classroom teacher.

Further research could be conducted with the set of validated criteria by having respondents rank order the criteria.

Since there were a number of criteria such as #1, #3, #4, #8, and #13 where inappropriate wording may have affected the responses, further research could be done by designing an instrument with the wording and presentation of the criteria altered, to determine whether or not ratings different from those obtained with the initial instrument would result.

An examination of current materials, programs, and curricula, in terms of the validated criteria would provide information on the amount and kinds of change that will be necessary to implement an integrated language arts program.

A fascinating study could be undertaken to determine whether the differences in degree of validation of the criteria between the Division I and Division II groups were due to the nature of the criteria themselves or to the possibility of real differences in approach and methods at the Division II level which are less conducive to integration.

Since it was the purpose of this investigation to synthesize a body of general statements which would attempt to define an integrated approach to the language arts, there is a definite need for further investigation into the specific ways by which the various subskills of each element of the language arts are integrated to compose that element.

There is a need to further translate the criteria into practical statements for classroom implementation.

Integration has been identified as an internal process which ultimately takes place within the learner. A definition of what integrative behavior involves or how it can be identified and strategies to develop such behavior would also be material for a fascinating investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Elementary Language Arts Handbook, Interim Edition, 1973.

Andrews, J. D. (Ed.). One Child Indivisible. Washington, D.C.: The National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1975.

Armstrong, R. Principles of Teaching Language. A lecture given at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, February 4, 1976.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Ideas, Problems, and Methods of Inquiry. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The Integration of Educational Experiences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

British Columbia Language Arts Guide, Primary Levels. Revised 1968. Victoria, British Columbia.

Britton, James (Ed.). Handbook for English Teachers, 2, Talking and Writing. London: Methuen Educational Ltd., 1967.

Britton, James. Language and Learning. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1970.

Burns, Paul C., Broman, Betty L., and Wantling, Alberta L. Lowe. The Language Arts in Childhood Education (2nd ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1971.

Cazden, C. Child Language and Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Crow, Lester D., Murray, Walter I., and Bloom, Irving. Teaching Language Arts in the Elementary School. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Book Co., 1968.

Dickie, Donald. The Enterprise in Theory and Practice. Toronto: W. J. Gage and Co. Limited, 1941.

Dressel, Paul L. Integration: An Expanding Concept. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The Integration of Educational Experiences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Dressel, Paul L. The Meaning and Significance of Integration. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The Integration of Educational Experiences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Dunkel, Harold B. Herbart and Education. New York: Random House, 1969.

Early, Margaret. The Four-Wheel Drive. Elementary English, 1974, 51, 707-12.

- Evanechko, Peter O. Reading is Only One of the Language Arts.
Language Arts, 1975, 52, 839-40.
- Gerbrandt, Gary L. An Idea Book for Acting Out and Writing Language.
NCTE, 1964.
- Gray, Lillian. Teaching Children to Read (3rd ed.). New York: The
Ronald Press Co., 1963.
- Gray, Lillian and Reese, Dora. Teaching Children to Read (2nd ed.).
New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1957.
- Greene, Harry A. and Petty, Walter T. Developing Language Skills in
the Elementary Schools (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon,
Inc., 1975.
- A Guide to Teaching the English Language Arts in the Intermediate
Years. Victoria, British Columbia: Province of British
Columbia, Department of Education, Division of Curriculum, 1968.
- Hall, Mary Anne. Teaching Reading as a Language Experience. Columbus,
Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.
- Halliday, M. A. K. Linguistics and the Teaching of English. In
James Britton (Ed.), Handbook for English Teachers, 2, Talking
and Writing. London: Methuen Educational Ltd., 1967.
- Henry, Nelson B. (Ed.). The Integration of Educational Experiences.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Kennedy, Larry D. Teaching the Elementary Language Arts. New York:
Harper and Row Publishers, 1975.
- Krathwohl, David R. The Psychological Bases for Integration. In
Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), The Integration of Educational Experiences.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Langer, Susanne. Philosophy in a New Key (3rd ed.). Cambridge,
Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- The Language Arts Curriculum. Saskatchewan Elementary Schools,
Divisions One and Two, 1971.
- Language Arts Curriculum Guide for Primary Schools. Department of
Education, Queensland, Australia, 1974.
- Loban, Walter. The Language of Elementary School Children. National
Council of Teachers of English Research Report. Champaign,
Illinois, 1963.
- Logan, Lillian M. and Logan, Virgil G. A Dynamic Approach to Language
Arts. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada, 1967.

Logan, Lillian M., Logan, Virgil G., and Paterson, Leona. Creative Communication: Teaching the Language Arts. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1972.

Maxwell, John. Integrating the Language Arts. In Walter T. Petty (Ed.), Issues and Problems in the Elementary Language Arts. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1968.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

National Council of Teachers of English. The English Language Arts. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952.

National Council of Teachers of English. An Experience Curriculum in English. A Report of the Curriculum Commission of the NCTE. W. Wilbur Hatfield, Chairman. New York: Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1935.

Petty, Walter T., Petty, Dorothy C., and Becking, Marjorie F. Experiences in Language. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973.

Rankin, Paul T. The Importance of Listening Ability. English Journal, 1928, 17, 623-630.

Robertson, Jean E. Integrate Language Arts. Instructor, 1974, 83, 41-42.

Rosen, Connie. All in the Day's Work. In James A. Britton (Ed.), Handbook for English Teachers, 2, Talking and Writing. London: Methuen Educational Ltd., 1967.

Rubin, Dorothy. Teaching Elementary Language Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Ruddell, Robert B. Reading-Language Instruction: Innovative Practices. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.

Smith, E. Brooks, Goodman, Kenneth S., and Meredith, Robert. Language and Thinking in School (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Smith, James A. Adventures in Communication: Language Arts Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

- Smith, James A. Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973.
- Strickland, Ruth G. The Language Arts in the Elementary School (3rd ed.). Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1969.
- Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.
- Taylor, Elvin. A New Approach to Language Arts in the Elementary School. New York: Parker Publishing Co. Inc., 1970.
- Thorn, Elizabeth A. and Braun, Carl. Teaching the Language Arts. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Limited, 1974.
- University of Alberta at Calgary. Faculty of Education. Brief to the Elementary School Program Committee, Calgary Public School Board, 1965.
- Washburne, Carleton. A Living Philosophy of Education. New York: The John Day Company, 1940.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
THE INSTRUMENT

A SET OF CRITERIA
TO DEFINE AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO THE LANGUAGE ARTS

The following survey is in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Masters Degree in Elementary Education, Language Arts. The survey is an attempt to define an integrated approach to the language arts by establishing a set of criteria which reflect a synthesis of the literature related to integrated language arts. The following criteria were seen to be the reoccurring themes within the literature searched. Each criterion is accompanied by an explanation statement and a practical application statement which may help you react to the criterion. The criteria are not arranged in any specific order of importance.

Your help is required to validate the set of criteria by rating them in light of what you believe to be an integrated approach to the language arts.

YOU ARE ASKED TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

1. READ the reaction statement, the explanation, and the practical application.
2. RATE each criterion as highly appropriate, appropriate, undecided, inappropriate, or highly inappropriate to your ideas of an integrated language arts approach, by placing a check mark in the space provided. ()
3. REACT to the criteria at the end of the survey by:
 - a) adding any criteria you feel may have been neglected in defining an integrated approach to language arts,
 - b) commenting on any reactions you may have had to the stated criteria.

CRITERIA TO DEFINE AN INTEGRATED
APPROACH TO LANGUAGE ARTS

highly
appropriate

appropriate

undecided

inappropriate

highly
inappropriate

- #1. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that language development involves the receptive arts of listening and reading, and the expressive arts of speaking and writing.

EXPLANATION: A balanced language arts program promotes competence in each of the four language arts, listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: During the language arts periods, the teacher provides children with the opportunity to listen, speak, read, and write, using each aspect to enhance the others.

() () () () ()

- #2. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of purpose to a communication situation in language arts activities.

EXPLANATION: A genuine communication situation involves purpose—the child knows why he is doing an activity. The activity is meaningful to the child—there is a reason or purpose for communicating in that particular mode.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher meeting this criterion might include activities such as having children interview each other to write biographies which will then be collected in a class booklet.

() () () () ()

- #3. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts uses the implicit knowledge about language which the child has to build explicit, formulated ideas about language.

EXPLANATION: The process of language expansion and increased effectiveness is essentially a continuation of the inductive method the child has been using in all his language learning since birth. The school language arts program can continue this learning through controlled experiences where children are lead to form generalizations predetermined by the curriculum or the teacher, based on their implicit knowledge of the language.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: Children implicitly know the grammar of the language by school age. Using language initiated by the children, grammar generalizations can be formed so that children can consciously use and manipulate the language.

() () () () ()

- #4. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts accepts the fact that all children have achieved a high degree of language competence in at least one dialect by the time they come to school.

EXPLANATION: Studies have shown that children possess all the basic sentence patterns and grammar of the adult language by the time they reach school; this applies to dialects as well as standard English.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher accepts the language the child brings to school, recognizing that the child's attitude toward himself is intimately related to his attitude toward his language. The teacher makes the child aware that there are different languages for different purposes.

highly
() appropriate

() appropriate

() undecided

() inappropriate

highly
() inappropriate

- #5. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language art stresses language development through the use and practice of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

EXPLANATION: Children's effectiveness in language arts is extended primarily through active involvement with listening, speaking, reading, and writing, rather than through passive learning about them.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher ensures that a substantial amount of teaching time is spent on children practicing the skills of language arts through use.

() () () () ()

- #6. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the oral language base of all the language arts.

EXPLANATION: When the child begins school, he is most familiar with the medium of speech as a method of communication. The familiarity he has with this medium can be used to build familiarity with the other aspects of language arts.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The children's oral language can be written down to familiarize them with sentences and writing. The sentences written down can be listened to, can be read, can be collected to form a story, or can be used for analysis when teaching specific skills.

() () () () ()

() highly
() appropriate

(appropriate

(undecided

() inappropriate

() highly inappropriate

- #7. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes the importance of audience to a communication situation and encourages a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes.

EXPLANATION: Expansion of the child's ability to use language in a variety of situations and for a variety of purposes is crucial to language development.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher provides situations where children present their work to classmates; to younger children (write a story to read to a grade one); to another class (prepare invitations to a science fair and send or read them to another class); to a mixed school group (present a speech); to adults, parents and teachers (put on a play or a series of skits).

- #8. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts stresses child-child interaction in dialogue, groups, and class discussions.

EXPLANATION: Children learn in the company of others. Peer discussions in small groups where the talk is centered on a task should be a basic learning activity conducted with regularity and method.

PRACTICAL EXPLANATION: The teacher provides activities where the children obtain the essential language experience and feedback necessary for a successful language arts program. ie. discuss aspects of a story just read or listened to with a small group, interview a friend on his favorite food, plan a mural from a story all have read, discuss a class problem.

- #9. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to () () () () () language arts uses many and varied materials to facilitate development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

EXPLANATION: The use of many and varied materials is necessitated if we are to make children aware of the many modes of communication and their purposes.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher frequently supplements readers and language texts with other resources—library, magazines, newspapers, films, field trips, guest speakers, records, and tapes.

- | | highly
appropriate | appropriate | undecided | inappropriate | highly
inappropriate |
|--|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|
| #10. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts organizes language arts activities in order to enhance the interrelatedness of the processes of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
EXPLANATION: Instruction in any aspect of language arts is best accompanied by instruction in some or all of the language arts. All of the language arts: deal with communication; have a common language base; involve the child's pool of experience and knowledge; are essentially language-thinking-feeling processes; are complementary forms of communication.
PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The children read or hear a story. Group discussion may follow where ideas are shared and clarified. Individuals or groups may then write a poem, draw a picture, or prepare and present a short skit, further clarifying ideas. | () | () | () | () | () |
| #11. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the language arts develop in a classroom environment characterized by mutual respect, acceptance, and trust by teachers and peers.
EXPLANATION: Giving the child a feeling of self-confidence and worth precedes instruction in any of the language arts. Reinforcement of ideas comes first, then instruction.
PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher encourages the child's natural way of expression, while also developing and familiarizing him with "school" language, making him aware of a variety of language styles and purposes. | () | () | () | () | () |
| #12. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts begins with the present experience and competence of the child in language.
EXPLANATION: The extent and nature of the child's individual experiences form the basis for his learning.
PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher uses language samples given by the children for examples and discussion. The teacher expands the child's experience through direct and vicarious experience, and then helps the child find and use language to clarify and organize his thinking and feeling about the experiences. | () | () | () | () | () |

- | | highly
appropriate | appropriate | undecided | inappropriate | highly
inappropriate |
|--|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|
| #13. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts considers the language arts in terms of the appropriateness and precision of a given mode for a given purpose and situation. EXPLANATION: The teacher and the child can evaluate communication in terms of whether or not the purpose was achieved. Correctness may be thought of as the final step in this process: overall fluency; building up of a repertoire, selection for effectiveness; selection for correctness (precision). PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher should give the child language experiences in many situations and help in developing and judging the kind of language appropriate to achieving the purpose; ie. reporting tasks, invitations, playing a game. | () | () | () | () | () |
| #14. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts attempts to provide children with many different modes for receiving and expressing in the language arts. EXPLANATION: The key is to expand the child's awareness of language so that he becomes a flexible user of language, choosing the right language for the right purpose. PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher familiarizes children with receptive modes such as watching, hearing, examining, tasting, smelling, sensing, as well as listening and reading; also with expressive modes such as describing, acting, miming, making, dancing, writing, and discussing. | () | () | () | () | () |
| #15. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts utilizes separate, though not isolated, periods to develop specific mechanical skills, as well as integrated experiences to facilitate the common elements of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. EXPLANATION: Lessons are necessary to teach specific skills which are characteristic of each element of the language arts, relating these to some aspect of communication. PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher may teach specific lessons in such things as decoding skills or punctuation which will then be used in a reading situation; specific lessons in handwriting which will be used when writing a story. | () | () | () | () | () |

#16. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that flexible time allotments are necessary for integration of the language arts.

EXPLANATION: If we attempt to divide the language arts into rigid time allotments for listening, reading, speaking, language skills, composition, spelling, and handwriting, we are in danger of isolating skills and giving children a false picture of the various components of language arts.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: The teacher will find it necessary on some days to use a greater part of the language arts time for listening, another day for reading, another for composition, and so on.

highly appropriate	appropriate	undecided	inappropriate	highly inappropriate
()	()	()	()	()

#17. REACTION STATEMENT: An integrated approach to language arts recognizes that the processes and skills of the language arts are also modes of communication in other subjects.

EXPLANATION: Social studies and science are content; language arts provides the modes through which communication is achieved.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: Teachers may integrate other parts of their program with the language arts by using social studies and science topics as the content for particular purposes—writing a report on an insect to add to a class science display could be used when teaching report-writing skills.

()	()	()	()	()
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA YOU FEEL MAY HAVE BEEN NEGLECTED _____

COMMENTS ON YOUR REACTIONS TO THE STATED CRITERIA _____

Your position:

() classroom teacher, grade _____ () other (please specify)

APPENDIX B

ACTUAL WRITTEN COMMENTS MADE BY RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX TO QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS—ACTUAL COMMENTS

Additional CriteriaNon-instructional Group

1. Perhaps something should be added re: the effectiveness of training on the part of the teacher—a well rounded background of training that would go beyond reading course work per se or language etc.
2. An integrated approach to L.A. should lead the child to the inductive realization that all lang. modes are complementary and cumulative.
3. An integrated L.A. approach necessitates an understanding of the relationships of thought and language by the teacher. Without that the integration aspect doesn't have much chance of survival.
4. The integrated L.A. program has as its culmination a product in the written mode at every grade level. (Britton's "crystalization of thoughts")
5. The integrated L.A. program is a progressive development of all the interrelated communication processes through the grades.
6. Although it is implied in some of your criteria, I wonder if the simultaneous development of concepts (thinking skills) and language should be given more emphasis.
7. What about the "active-oral-written" process and the "concrete-abstract"?
8. Critical criteria—many of the criteria listed could very well apply to any method or approach e.g. Language experience, linguistic.

Instructional Group

1. We need to have the structured teaching of skills and mechanics as a part of any program.

General CommentsNon-instructional Group

1. Some very basic elements—crucial to all aspects of communication—are being considered. It looks good.

2. I do not question the criteria—they read like a "mother's day card." Would it help to have some other criteria that might be more controversial—I tended to begin not to read the item but to just check "highly appropriate"—will this contaminate what you are doing—I felt 'lulled' by the statements. Could the list be shortened to included only those unique to the integrated approach?
3. I found it difficult to decide between appropriate and highly appropriate—ie. how strong one's feelings are about each statement at that moment. Also, my rating often changed from the reaction statement to the practical application—in other words, my interpretation of the reaction statement alone was not always the same as yours, as illustrated by your explanation and practical application.
4. Criteria good—maybe 9 and 14 could be collapsed? What about thinking skills are common to the language arts—NB. Need to work on separating the differences between reaction statement/explanation/practical application. Could cut down on the amount written for each criteria, see no. 6.
5. I did struggle much with terms and ideas. For what it is worth here is my paper.
6. Well stated. Well chosen.
7. Many of the criteria seem most applicable to a program for children beginning school. If the criteria are to be applicable at all levels in the elementary school the criteria should also recognize that the starting point for growth and development in language can be reading.
Reading does not fit comfortably into many of the criteria—and the explanation and practical applications seem to relate to oral and written expression—the criteria are valuable, but would be more so if the role of reading in an integrated program could be more clearly delineated.
8. I find most of your criteria highly appropriate.
9. I have answered this questionnaire from the point of view of one attempting to determine a definition and understanding of the concept of integration; in other words, I have assumed that you have underlined the word integrated in all instances. If your purpose is to develop criteria appropriate to a language arts program, then all are appropriate—or highly appropriate.
 If you think of reading, writing, listening and speaking as midpoints on a continuum and the extremes of the continuum are called (for lack of better terms) the microcosm and macrocosm, then in terms of integration

I think you have given an example of the macrocosm—integrating language arts skills into other subject areas (#17) but no example of the microcosm. The microcosm is most easily seen in reading. Teachers frequently teach the "subskills" of reading but don't always attempt to integrate them into the total, meaningful act of reading. For example, the word attack skills are taught and learned for their own sake. Likewise, syllabication rules. It is the integration in this more "microscopic" area which is important and which may be the most difficult to get a hold of. On the other hand, the listening, speaking, and writing areas have had their "microcosms of subskills" almost totally ignored by teachers—the subskills have not been clearly identified, thence a lack of understanding of what these really involve.

10. Thoughtfully compiled.

11. This amount of space does not really encourage comments.

Instructional Group

1. Most of these, in my estimation, were highly appropriate. Is that what you anticipated? Be sure to let your respondents know of the results of your survey.
2. In my limited experience I feel that the 17 statements given here encompass the necessary criteria to define an integrated approach to the Language Arts program.
3. The emphasis appears to be overwhelmingly based on speaking, reading, listening. This could only be accomplished with a very small pupil-teacher ratio. Written skills are often lost because of our emphasis on oral skills. A balance is needed.
4. We feel all these criteria are important, and we follow them in our classroom.
5. Let's integrate.
6. I am impressed by the thoroughness of this set of criteria.
7. Integration seems the most sensible and efficient way to teach.
8. I found that the 17 statements covered what we are trying to accomplish in the Language Arts program quite well with the exception of the reading area. ie. reading for comprehension skills. It seems that more stress was put on what usually was classed as "Language."
9. Your criteria reflects the thinking behind the philosophy of the language curriculum. It is excellent.

10. Nothing, but our classes are large, time-tables often not flexible, little space, and equipment sparse for an integrated program. Many good ideas, very comprehensive.
11. Fully covered.
12. Certainly would be great if we could implement a program with all these ideas—how super.
13. Well thought out and described.
14. Good—very complete.
15. Has covered a wide area of language arts. I am undecided about time allotments as I have shown.

Comments on Criterion #1

Non-instructional Group

1. Scope: what is taught
Sequence: arrangement—ordering of activities is an important consideration for each child; often only the child can determine by giving his preference.
2. Practical application could be more specific.
3. Involves the four you mention—yes so #1 criterion is OK as far as verbal language is concerned. What about non-verbal? miming, movement, viewing. Perhaps another criterion is needed or non-verbal expression that contribute to language development should be incorporated in #1.
4. Is it "performance" or "competence" that the school contributes to?
5. Too limiting to say reception is only listening and reading, and expression is only speaking and writing?

Instructional Group

1. Viewing?? (important receptive activity)

Comments on Criterion #2

Non-instructional Group

1. Practical application—good eg. try and make all practical applications as specific?

2. Applies to teachers as well as to students.
3. Statements #2 and #7—These are important to the development of Language Arts competence per se, but I'm not sure they are part of the essence of integration.

Instructional Group

1. This is not unique to integrated Language Arts.

Comments on Criterion #3

Non-instructional Group

1. Is the inductive approach the only approach? Is it appropriate at all levels?
2. Respondent circled words "knowledge" "has" in Reaction Statement and "know" in Practical Application.
3. Carol Chomsky and others seem to have reached the conclusion that children continue to develop their implicit use of the grammar of their language up to at least the age of ten. You imply here that their knowledge is quite comprehensive by the time they enter school.
4. Practical application—could be more specific.
5. Does this suggest that only inductive methods are appropriate for an integrated language arts program?
6. Respondent underlined "the language" in Practical Application and suggested "their"?

Instructional Group

1. They do not know the grammar of the language by school age. (very few)
2. This appears to assume common experiential background.
3. #3 and #11—are we allowing communication to deteriorate by relying too much on the child's implicit understanding and by simply presenting "school" language as an alternative to be accepted or not.

Comments on Criterion #4Non-instructional Group

1. The idea is good but not true because of the word "all" which is circled. Is it most?
2. Respondent circled "all" in Reaction Statement—asked "most?".
3. Is it "true" that all children have achieved a high degree of language competence . . .? Surely there are some children who come to school with their language potential considerably underdeveloped even in their own dialect.
4. Question use of word "all."
5. Respondent circled word "all" in Reaction Statement—"most" added.
6. Respondent circled "language" in Explanation—asked "dialect?".
7. Respondent circled "all" in Reaction Statement, underlined "a high degree"—asked "some?".

Instructional Group

1. Practical Application—appropriate but at times hard to do successfully.

Comments on Criterion #5Non-instructional Group

1. But surely any language arts program would stress (or should) this principle? Is this principle not an extension of #1?
2. Are these criteria ordered in any particular way? If so #5 seems closely related to #1. "teaching" time? or time allotted for language arts. i.e. learning via using language.
3. Practical Application too general.
4. Respondent circled "language development" in Reaction Statement—meaning language competence?
5. Why need it be passive. Your bias is showing. We may need to actively learn about them.

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #6Non-instructional Group

1. What about later on, say the fifth year of school, is oral language still the base of the program? I don't think so and would therefore modify the Reaction Statement.
2. Respondent circled "most" and "speech" in Explanation. Added words expressive and verbal with a line to "communication" in Explanation.
3. Would not aural/oral be better here since the child's first learnings in language tend to be through this channel?
4. ie. to help them realize there is a relationship between oral and written communication?
5. Reaction Statement—This example is very clear. Practical Application—omit first sentence—child produces oral.
6. Many other approaches also make this assumption.
7. Respondent underlined "used for analysis" in Practical Application—asked What's this? but "learning about."

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #7Non-instructional Group

1. 'Audience' to me implies a rather large group. Do you mean simply sender/receiver?
2. Practical Application—good.

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #8Non-instructional Group

1. I wonder if stresses isn't too strong? How about using "recognizes the importance of" again?

2. include adults, teachers.
3. I notice that you have left the teacher out of this. Does he/she have a role to play here? eg. Conference between teacher and pupil concerning a book that has been read?
4. Practical Application, Explanation—repetitive.
5. Respondent added at end of Explanation "if guided by the teacher initially."
6. But what about models—parents were—why not other adults in the school setting?

Instructional Group

1. good.

Comments on Criterion #9

Non-instructional Group

1. Respondent circled "uses" in Reaction Statement and put "?" behind it.
2. Again applicable to any language arts program—integration or otherwise.
3. What about the books on the content areas—do you consider them "readers" if children are using them to gather information?

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #10

Non-instructional Group

1. and the distinctiveness of the different processes?
2. To me that is a key reaction statement and probably the most important criterion of an Integrated Language Arts program. However, the explanation and application could apply to any program—integrated or not. There is a danger in people saying "if that's all integration is—I've been doing that in my class for years." There is in my view a more deliberate way of organizing the activities in a truly integrated program.

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #11Non-instructional Group

1. Again a principle that could and should be applied to almost any learning situation. Do you see "school" language as one of the dimensions of formality? and do you mean the language the child uses in talking to the teacher? other pupils? etc?

Instructional Group

1. good.

Comments on Criterion #12Non-instructional Group

1. Is this not an extension of #3?

Instructional Group

1. I would like to stress my agreement with the statement about expanding the child's experience through vicarious experience etc. I think children can learn and develop a good literary style by looking at and studying example stories etc. from readers and library books.
2. basic to any form of teaching—not specific to integrated language arts.

Comments on Criterion #13Non-instructional Group

1. seems to be a repetition of #2.
2. an extension of #2.
3. Are you equating "correctness" and "precision"? eg. the word used may be correct if it conveys meaning; how much meaning? depends on precision.

Instructional Group

1. If this method used too much with primary children the natural spontaneity of language communication could be lost. "Correctness" and "precision" are structured social skills which could be emphasized later.

Comments on Criterion #14Non-instructional Group

1. Could this not be combined with #1 to make a single criterion?
2. Another "motherhood" statement. Are these (ie tasting, smelling, sensing) "language modes"? Are you including mime and other forms of body language as language arts?
3. ie. non-verbal—as well as verbal.
4. very similar to #9.
5. multisensory.
6. I'm unhappy with the way in which this is expressed—does not seem consistent with #1.

Instructional Group

No comments.

Comments on Criterion #15Non-instructional Group

1. Respondent referred to "teach" in Practical Application—"includes practice and application?"
2. terminology confusing.
3. I feel that perhaps this statement should include a clause about "when the children(a child) realize(s) the need to improve a communication." This might prevent the misunderstanding that mechanical skills (handwriting, grammar, spelling) may be taught in a vacuum and still be a part of an integrated language arts program.
4. Respondent circled "separate" in Reaction Statement—"specific" and related but not always "separate."

Instructional Group

1. very important—cannot be over stressed.

Comments on Criterion #16Non-instructional Group

1. I believe a guideline of minutes per week can still be suggested.
2. Again a principle that could be applied to teaching in any subject and topic area.
3. From the standpoint of actual classroom practice, are listening, writing, for example, considered as part of language arts "time" or as part of total school program—ie. integrated with content.
4. good teaching-learning practises.

Instructional Group

1. very difficult to cover all aspects of program within allotted language arts time.
2. can be a problem when running more than one group—but can certainly be overcome.
3. in lower elementary, it's pretty difficult to work on a flexible time schedule when such a variety of skills are to be taught in all areas.

Comments on Criterion #17Non-instructional Group

1. This should be #2. It's really important.
2. By what other means can you communicate in other subjects? I presume that your principle implies that "other subject" area instruction carried out by teachers does not (always) aim at developing skills in the language arts?
3. Oh, oh. Here it is at last. Not neglected but I wonder why last on the list. . . . eg. reading—no content of its own.

Instructional Group

1. Subject exchanges make this difficult. Group planning and communicating becomes essential.
2. We must also teach children to use these in other subjects specifically.

B30171